THE RELATIONS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES WITH THE EASTERN ORTHODOX

J. A. DOUGLAS

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NOTTINGHAM

THE RELATIONS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES WITH THE EASTERN-ORTHODOX

By the same Author:

PICTURES OF RUSSIAN WORSHIP 1915

THE SACRAMENTS IN RUSSIA 1915

THE REDEMPTION OF ST. SOPHIA 1919

LONDON: THE FAITH PRESS

C

PREFACE

In addition to explaining the method by which I believe the Eastern-Orthodox could be enabled to recognize our Orders, I wrote this little book with the double purpose of making plain to Anglican readers both the eager spirit in which our Eastern-Orthodox friends approach the problem of Reunion with us and the difficulties which in my judgment make such Reunion impossible at present.

In writing it, I have endeavoured simply to state the Eastern-Orthodox point of view and have avoided from first to last alike the discussion of whether that point of view is justifiable and the vindication of our own. It has been my business to accept the Eastern-Orthodox as in earnest when uttering a non-possumus, and where their position is irreconcilable with our own, to say so.

Of the necessity of the case I have dealt with Professor Androutsos' four questions on our Orders as directed to "High Churchmen," but though I trust that I may rightly term myself Anglo-Catholic, I have tried to remember that by their principles the Eastern-Orthodox can contemplate Reunion only with the whole Anglican Communion. I have, therefore, laboured to remember the differences of opinion among us and to discuss the question of Reunion in the light of their existence.

In the use of the word Papalist, I have had no intention of acerbity, and I hope that it will not prove offensive to any of the Papal Obedience who may read these pages. Roman Catholic, Latin and so forth would, in view of the existence of the Uniates, be out

of place. At the same time, the fact that the Eastern-Orthodox account the Papal claim to infallibility and supreme overlordship as the first and chief cause of the Great Schism, makes the designation appropriate in this little book.

In the reading of my proofs I have had the great advantage of the help of my friend the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, to whom the development of the *rapprochement* between the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches is due more than to any living man. Dr. Leighton Pullan, Father Puller of S.S.J.E., the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, the Rev. G. Napier Whittingham, Dr. Wigram of the Assyrian Mission, and others[1] gave me the great assistance of examining the suggested Declaration in Chapter IV, the final terms of which they approved, but for which I am, of course, solely responsible, as for the purport of this little book.

I should also acknowledge the kindness of His Excellency, Dr. Gennadius, that rare friend of our cause, the Archimandrite Basdekas, the Metropolitan of Seleucia, the Head of the Theological College at Halki, the Archpriest Callinicos of Manchester, the Protosyncellos of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and its Arch-Scribe Fr. Dionysios, Professor Comnenos of Halki, the Arch-priest Smirnoff and Miss Dampier in lending me books or in giving me information.

It is indeed possible that the only value of this little book may be found in the passages from modern authoritative Eastern-Orthodox writers printed in Appendix I or quoted in my four chapters. If the reading of them is as profitable to others as the getting them together has been to myself, I shall be amply repaid.

I am under no small debt to Miss K. M. Rayner for the pains and skill which she has expended in deciphering

[1] I should add Father Waggett and Mr. Athelstan Riley.

my perplexing handwriting and in turning my MS. into typescript for the press.

Finally, I will venture to plead that omission does not testify non-existence. If I have not urged the need and duty of Reunion in these pages, it is because I had a humbler purpose and wrote them in the hope of preparing the way for those who are called to that happy task. I trust that I, too, am of those who pray and work for the Peace of Jerusalem.

P.S.—That what I have written is not wholly unwarranted is shown by a letter which I received from a leading Greek Theologian who recently visited London and to whom I had sent a synopsis of these pages. He writes: "My conclusion is that our Church must recognise your Orders as she recognises the Orders of the Roman Catholics and Armenians, and consequently recognise also all your Sacraments, that is not only your Baptism, but your Confirmation, Eucharist, Marriage, etc.; and if a person ordained by you comes to us and accepts our Faith, we must accept him in his Orders. But as concerns Intercommunion we must . . . wait until the Union takes place, that is until we come to an agreement about the fundamental truths which are to be believed sufficient for the Union."

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE 5

CHAPTER I. THE PRELIMINARY TO INTERCOMMUNION . . 11

CHAPTER II. ECONOMY 40

CHAPTER III. ECONOMY AND ANGLICAN ORDERS . . . 63

CHAPTER IV. A PATH TOWARDS REUNION 89

APPENDIXES

I. THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE PRIESTHOOD . 113

II. THE ŒCUMENICAL CHURCH AND THE AUTOCEPHALOUS CHURCHES 165

III. EASTERN-ORTHODOX ECONOMY IN REGARD TO HETERODOX SACRAMENTS 177

IV. LISTS OF BOOKS 187

INDEX 195

The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern-Orthodox

CHAPTER I

THE PRELIMINARY TO INTERCOMMUNION

IN the year 1902, there being frequent cases of Eastern-Orthodox lay folk seeking the Sacraments at the hands of Anglican priests in America, the latter formally asked the Great Church of Constantinople whether she would approve their acceding to the request.

At the same time, other priests of the American Episcopalian Church asked what in effect was the same question in a narrower form, namely, whether in the event of Intercommunion being established, the Great Church of Constantinople was prepared to accept Anglican Orders as valid.

The professors of the Theological College of Halki, to whom the matter was referred according to precedent, not unnaturally turned their attention to the question of the Validity of Anglican Orders, without the acceptance of which a negative answer to the former question was inevitable.

The most notable result of this investigation was the publication in 1903 by Professor Chrestos Androutsos[1] of his monograph, "The Validity of English Ordinations from an Orthodox-Catholic point of view," a work which was first published as an article

[1] Books referred to are described in full under the author's name in the List of Book in Appendix IV.

in the official organ of the Œcumenical Patriarchate[1] and at once obtained and retains high authority in the Greek Orthodox Churches.

In the scope of his investigation Professor Androutsos was guided by two considerations :—

(i) That " Intercommunion[2] or, as we (sc. the Eastern-Orthodox) call it, External Union, based on mutual love and sympathy and manifested in such acts as above (sc. the mutual reception of the Sacraments) can never produce the expected fruits of Union apart from Dogmatic Union."[3]

(ii) That to enquire into the validity of Anglican Orders would be " opposed to the fundamental principles of Orthodoxy according to which bodies which secede from the Church cannot preserve unity and communion with the true Church ; and so from an Orthodox point of view such enquiries are both irregular and worthless."[4]

He therefore safeguarded himself against being construed as pronouncing upon the general and fundamental validity of Anglican Orders and confined himself to enquiring whether it would be possible to accept them as valid in the case of " the reception of individual Anglican clerics into the bosom of Orthodoxy."

In other words, he directed his investigation to the question as to whether, presuming the individual Anglican priest to be in dogmatic union with the

[1] Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια.

[2] Similar declarations as to Dogmatic Union being tantamount to Reunion and as to Reunion being impossible without Dogmatic Union may be quoted very plentifully. Khomiakoff's letters to Palmer, which on the Russian side may be taken as typical, abound in passages which make them a sermon on that text, e.g. " Union cannot be understood by any Orthodox otherwise than as the consequence of a complete harmony, or of a perfect *Unity of Doctrine* (I do not speak of rites, excepting in the case where they are symbols of a dogma). The Church in itself has nothing of a state, and can admit of nothing like conditional Union." *Russia and the English Church*, Birkbeck, p. 7, and so Philaret quoted by Khomiakoff (the same, p. 80). " Unity of rites being very desirable indeed, but unity of dogma being the only condition *sine qua non*."

[3] Androutsos, p. 5.

[4] The same, p. 6.

Eastern-Orthodox Churches, i.e. to share their faith, he might be received in his Orders.

Upon examination, he found the "visible part" of our ordinations, i.e. the succession of our bishops, the formulae of consecration and so forth, to be unchallengeable. In regard, however, to the "invisible part," i.e. the purpose to make a priest "in the Orthodox-Catholic sense," while he rejected the Papal argument and decision to condemn them, he was not able to declare them incontestable. That he found himself unable to do so was due partly to the writings of some Anglican theologians but chiefly to his finding ambiguity in our formularies and especially in our Thirty-nine Articles which appeared to him to be patient of a denial of the Orthodox doctrine of the Priesthood.

The result of his investigation, however, was so favourable that he specified certain points, a satisfactory declaration upon which—apparently not necessarily by the authorities of the Anglican Churches but by a large section of the Anglican Church, e.g. "the High Church,"[1]—would justify the Orthodox Churches (the limitations he fixed in his enquiry must be remembered) in accepting as valid the Orders of Anglican priests who wished to be received into Orthodoxy.

"This long investigation," he wrote, ". . . persuades me that, provided the High Church (party) accepts grace as being transmitted[2] in priesthood and provided it does not hold the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist, nor intends, in any way, to prejudice the priestly character, the dogmatic difficulties of the English Ordinal, studied in humility and Christian love from an Orthodox-Catholic point of view, are capable of receiving a more favourable judgment than the one they received from Pope Leo XIII and from the old Catholics of Holland. But in order to put an end to

[1] ἡ ἄνω Ἐκκλησία.
[2] χάρω μεταδιδομένην ἐν ἱερωσύνῃ.

such difficulties and to remove all such doubts from Orthodox-Catholics as they experience, this Church of England must lay down generally, in a General Council of her prelates, the doctrine of the ancient Church as a sure foundation and as an unquestioned principle; and by reason of such principle she must wrench round the Articles, and consider them as resolutions[1] of a Local Council, holding them good only so far as they agree with the ancient doctrines, as Damalas laid down that she should do.

"In particular, the High Church (party) will solve the question of its priesthood by defining, wisely and truly, what faith it holds as of primary importance, and by defining what doctrine it holds in the dogmas which are bound up with the priesthood and which are shown in its divinely bestowed character and in its excellent power, that is to say:—

1. *As regards the Sacraments.* Does it receive the Seven Sacraments?
2. *As regards Confession.* Does it take Confession as a necessary condition for the remission of sins; and the priestly absolving of sins as included in the authority given *to it*[2] by the Lord?
3. *As regards the Eucharist.* How does it accept the Real Presence of the Lord? And what is the character of the Unbloody Sacrifice?[3]
4. *As regards the Œcumenical Councils.* Will it receive these Councils as infallible organs of the true Church,[4] the declarations of which bind *eo ipso* every particular Church and accept them always as the true faith?

"If the High Church (party) define these dogmas correctly and lay down the rest of its doctrines in an

[1] ψηφίσματα.
[2] The original means to *him*, sc. the priest.
[3] ἀναίμακτος θυσία.
[4] ὡς ὄργανα τῆς ἀληθοῦς Ἐκκλησίας ἀνεπισφαλή.

orthodox manner, all doubt would be taken away as to the succession of English ordinations, and at the same time, solid foundations would be laid for a *rapprochement* and for a true union with the Eastern Church—a work well pleasing to God and one of blessing from every point of view."[1]

Written as they were by a theologian of the first rank after a long and patient investigation to which he had been commissioned by the highest authority in the Eastern-Orthodox Churches and published by that authority with every mark of approval, these words are plainly in the nature of an invitation. That they were intended to be such the then Œcumenical Patriarch, Joachim III and Professor Androutsos told me plainly in 1904. Moreover, they were written by one who thoroughly understood the conditions of things in the Church of England and knew that, to say the least, time must elapse before it could be expected that a General Council of Anglican Bishops would make the declarations without which Dogmatic Union, that is to say Reunion, are impossible from an Eastern-Orthodox point of view.

It was, therefore, clearly something of an open letter to High Churchmen and invited them to reply to four explicit questions with a plain and unambiguous answer which might satisfy the Eastern-Orthoox authorities that a very large body of Anglicans held the same doctrine of the Ministry as themselves and might justify them in accepting our Orders as valid in regard to their purpose and rite.

It is surprising and disappointing that up to the present no attempt has been made, or, as far as I am aware, has even been considered, to respond to that invitation. This surprise and disappointment do not arise from a feeling that the *cachet* of an Eastern-Orthodox

[1] Androutsos, pp. 112–114. See also Bulgakoff's *Question of Anglican Orders*, p. 44, quoted below, p. 64.

pronouncement in favour of our Orders would make us more sure of their validity. There are, no doubt, some Anglican priests who would be relieved at finding that after examining them in relation both to their historico-canonical succession and to their intention or purpose, Eastern-Orthodox theologians of the highest authority had pronounced that they could be accepted as readily as Papalist Orders. Without doubt such an opinion would have its value and would serve to show that Pope Leo XIII's decision against them was *ex parte* and not judicial. But with few exceptions we are all agreed about that, and in effect the Pope's condemnation of our Orders has been a hindrance to whatever Romeward movement may exist among us.

It is, of course, plain also that in our controversy with Rome, a favourable judgment on our Orders from Eastern-Orthodox theologians would be unpleasant for those Papalist publicists who taunt us in equivocal sentences with their "rejection" by the Orthodox Church. Their discomfiture at the spiking of that trusted though ineffective weapon would certainly be considerable. They would, however, soon recover themselves, and, as in the case of the Nag's Head fable, find something to take its place. It is not on such grounds that we regret the silence with which Professor Androutsos' monograph was received in England, a silence which in retrospect appears the more amazing on account of the practical consequences that might well have resulted from a satisfactory reply to it.[1]

Our "High Church" leaders of sixteen years ago may, of course, have given it their attention and have concluded that nothing could be done. At any rate, their inaction has some excuse in the fact that in 1903 the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches were still far away from each other. The chill which fell on the few workers for Reunion, left after the Bonn

[1] See below, Chapters III and IV.

blunders and fiasco, was still prevalent. In spite of the labours of Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury and others, the preparation of a *terrain* of mutual intercourse and understanding had hardly been begun in England. But in the light of the past six years, it is apparent that if, as seems certain, Professor Androutsos was speaking as the mouthpiece of the then Œcumenical Patriarch,[1] and if, for example, the bishops and priests of the English Church Union had answered him in the fashion that he expected, for practical purposes what may be termed *economical*[2] Intercommunion would now be habitual and widespread between Anglicans and the Eastern-Orthodox.

In saying this I do not mean that there would have been any likelihood of an Act of Union being proclaimed between the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches. As has been said above, I am convinced that for the Eastern-Orthodox full and formal Reunion can be considered only on the basis of Dogmatic Union.[3]

When for example, Professor Headlam suggested in his Bampton Lectures last year that we should propose Reunion to the Eastern-Orthodox on the dogmatic basis of our common acceptance of the so-called Nicene Creed, but with freedom to differ from each other, for example, on the doctrine of the Ministry and the Sacraments, he proposed something which the Eastern-Orthodox are bound, firmly if kindly, to refuse even to discuss.

It may, indeed, well be, as he urged, that there is no other basis on which the totality of Christians can unite.

The respectful and sympathetic attention which those who cannot altogether accept his conclusions

[1] The famous Joachim III, with whom I myself had more than one conversation on the subject.

[2] See below, Chapter IV.

[3] Thus Meletios, Archbishop of Athens, told us in London in 1919 that "Union must be not a mere arrangement between the hierarchies but a union of the faith and hearts of the people."

must give his lectures, is not due simply to their being the fruit of his life's thought and study.

If I may say so, as one who believes creeds when used as affirmations to be unifying and stimulating, but distrusts credal tests as deadening and disintegrating, I cannot but admire and warm to the courageous hope with which he tells us that Anglicans and Non-episcopalians in England can and ought promptly to rally in their Master's service under the common banner of the historic Creed. His vision is a great vision. No one can read what he wrote[1] without wishing to be persuaded.

But whether his arguments be valid and his hope be cogent to us, is immaterial in relation to the Eastern-Orthodox. When he suggests[1] that there is a possibility of their entering into Union with the Anglican Churches as they are, or with the totality of the United Non-Papalist Christianity of England simply on the basis of the Creed with provisos of an agreement as to the Filioque, of the mutual recognition of orders and of mutual liberty as to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence, he is holding out an expectation which, as things are, is altogether illusory. It is obvious that a Church in which Dr. Sanday, Dr. Henson, Dr. Gore, Canon Lacey, Dr. Weston and Father Puller can go on together would find no difficulty in an act of union on such terms, in agreeing to any other than which it is hard to conceive unanimity among Anglicans. It is otherwise with the Eastern-Orthodox. Eighty years ago, when Palmer explored the Russian Church, or in the days when Neale did his work and Pusey wrote his Eirenicon, the Eastern-Orthodox were as strange to English folk as were the Japanese in the 'eighties. Their Church life, their theology, their very psychology were indeterminate to us and ours to them. To-day that is a state of the past. Mutual study and, above all, the

[1] Bampton Lectures for 1920, pp. 297, 298.

sharing of the most sacred intimacies of Religion have begun to bring us to know them and them to know us, with the knowledge that kinsmen who are neighbours have of each other. It is not now a question of their finding out where we are or of our finding out where they are. We are aware of their position and they are aware of ours.

Some of us might wish it otherwise, but it is not only, as Dr. Headlam is almost certainly right in saying, that the Faith of the age of Chalcedon is the only basis on which Reunion with Non-episcopalian Christians in England is possible. Over and above the bearing of the fact upon that Home Reunion which is alike the great need of our nation and the obvious, if not the necessary, preliminary to any movement for world-wide Reunion, it is patent that, without the risk of disruption in the Anglican Churches, no other basis of Reunion could be formulated to-day by a majority, if one could be obtained among us to formulate it.

On the other hand, the Eastern-Orthodox have made it plain, and that repeatedly, in the last three and a half centuries, that the only basis of Reunion which they can conceive, is that of the Faith of the Undivided Church of the first nine centuries.[1] It was on the ground that the rising claims of the Papacy in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries were an innovation upon that Faith that the Greeks were unwilling even to discuss them. It is first and foremost because they hold the Filioque,[2] Baptism by Affusion, the use of azymite bread and the absence of the Epiklesis in the Western Eucharist, the withholding the chalice from the laity

[1] See the quotations in Appendix i § i.

[2] Pope Leo III had ordered the Creed without Filioque to be inscribed in silver tablets, and so affixed to the doors of St. Peter's at Rome in 809. The subsequent defence of the interpolation by Pope Nicholas I raised fierce protest in the East, less on account of itself than on account of the Papal claim to alter *proprio motu* the Œcumenical Creed. That ground of protest has always been in the forefront of the Eastern-Orthodox case and has always been obscured by Papalists, see Burns, *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 116-119.

or the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin to be innovations upon the Faith, and only secondly and not always because they find them inconsistent with it, that they have protested against them.

It was for that Faith that they went into schism with the West in the Eleventh Century. It was because they were unable without an essential sacrifice of conscience to compromise their loyalty to that Faith as they knew it that they brought upon themselves the cruelty of the Fourth Crusade, that in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, both at Lyons and at Florence, they refused to say the word of apostasy which would have been rewarded by that help from the West for which they were perishing, and that at long last, having passed under the heel of the Turk, they have had the courage to be true to it and to themselves in an indescribable and sealed underworld of helotage for over four and a half centuries.

If there has been anything fundamental to a nation, a culture or a theology—and we have had ample experience in England that except in books the three categories cannot be separated—it is fundamental to the Greek that the Faith of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches is neither more nor less than the Faith of the Undivided Church of the Œcumenical Councils and that the Faith of that Church was in every essential the unchanged Faith of the Church of the Apostles.

We have here not a fundamental of abstract controversy but a fundamental with which the Greeks have been ingrained by a secular process.

To shift their ground from it would be to rewrite their history and to reshape their characteristics as a nation no less completely than an absolute repudiation of all need for a Reformation in the Sixteenth Century would compel us to rewrite and to reshape our own. It would constrain them to justify, if not the policy, at least the motive with which, as Professor Diehl puts

it, from the Twelfth Century onwards the Papacy held it "pour but constant de sa politique de refaire, de gré ou de force, l'union des églises"[1] and in pursuit of which they are passionately convinced that, having robbed them of their freedom, having watched them with sardonic satisfaction in the long-drawn agony of their oppression by Islam,[2] and having waited with eagerness for their extinction, in pursuit of its inexorable determination to subdue or to destroy them, it has intrigued in recent days to prevent their recovery of their mother city and their national shrine, and has secured Mustapha Kemal liberty to Turkify Asia Minor by wiping it clean alike of its Christian population and of its Christian monuments.[3]

As to whether they are right or wrong in their arraignment of the Papacy is here immaterial. The point to bear in mind is that the nation as a whole[4] holds that its sufferings were the punishment of its fidelity to the Faith of the Undivided Church of the Œcumenical Councils, and treasures that Faith as the very Ark of its Covenant.

Mutatis mutandis, it is the same with the Russian, Serb, Ruman and other nations which with the Greeks make up the free sodality of the Eastern-Orthodox World.

In the history of each, whether its record be a record of slavery and disaster or a record of freedom and prosperity, devotion to the Faith of the Church of the Œcumenical Councils has been above everything its

[1] *Byzance*, C. Diehl, 1919 (Flammarion, Paris), p. 248.

[2] See the writer's *Redemption of St. Sophia*, 4th edition (Faith Press), chap. V.

[3] On August 15th, 1920, the Kemalists wrecked the sixth-century Church of the Koimesis at Nicæa, the only historic and symbolic Greek Church which had never been converted into a mosque, and massacred the whole Christian population of that and other places. It is stated that the Greek army a few miles away at Brusa had been forbidden to advance. The Greeks of Constantinople, let us hope wrongly, believe the embargo to have been given by the Italian Government at the instance of the Vatican. See *Christian East*, December, 1920.

[4] Something like 95 per cent. of the Greeks belong to the Eastern-Orthodox Churches.

controlling inspiration and the most cherished of its glories.

Moreover, in spite of the recent artificial creation of state nationalities which are still unreal, it remains true that Religion and Nationality, as has been often observed, are still interchangeable terms in the Balkans and the Levant. That is because under the conditions of life which prevailed and still prevail, men of the same religion have been differentiated from their neighbours for centuries by their customs, laws, education, outlook, experience, and so forth, i.e., in just those aspects of civilized life of which their common traditional and conventional Religion is the formative principle. English Religion is complex. Liberalism in its search for Truth[1] has accustomed it to a variety of systems. The most thorough mediævalist among us can only claim that his own is fundamental for himself, and must admit that English culture is able to adapt itself to any earthquake of science or of thought.

It is different with the mass of the Eastern-Orthodox. Their culture is founded on their cosmology, and their cosmology is held by them to be derived from the Faith of the Undivided Church of the Œcumenical Councils.

We are often reminded, though, perhaps, with some exaggeration, of the chasm which separates the *intelligentsia* in Eastern-Orthodox countries from the bulk of their fellow countrymen. Most of us consider that to be a phenomenon of evil portent. But at any rate it is there. They are sharply divided from their co-nationals. Among the great bulk of the Eastern-Orthodox the abandonment of the ancient fundamentals of Orthodoxy, not by evolution or explosion from within, but on the suggestion of outsiders, would produce for all except the *intelligentsia* bewilderment and chaos and unreality of sanctions in every category of

[1] See, for example, Dr. Sanday's *Nunc Dimittis* (Faith Press, 1920), p. 11 *et seq.*

life throughout the whole vast solidarity.[1] The effect of the repudiation of the Bible in Cromwellian England would probably have been no greater.

In drawing attention to these considerations, it is certainly not my purpose to advocate the Faith of the Ninth Century as the basis of Reunion against that of the Fifth. Nor is it in my mind, whatever my own doctrinal standpoint may be, to criticise the adoption of the Creed of Chalcedon as the dogmatic basis on which the Anglican Churches should unite with those to whom it would be a maximum. Broadly speaking, it is the basis on which the varied schools of thought among us are agreed to remain united and on which, if their conflicts are not appeased, at least they are finding an increased will to unity.

After all there is truth in the homely Manx proverb: "My skin is nearer to me than my shirt." It would be a dearly-bought approximation to the Eastern-Orthodox position that was purchased by an Anglican schism or by the slamming of the door on Home Reunion.

Nor is it in my scope to examine whether it is desirable that the Eastern-Orthodox should shift their ground or whether on their own principles that ground is firm.

My object is to stress the facts that the Orthodox world rests upon Orthodox Theology, and that, if I may use the metaphor (for Orthodoxy is not a dry doctrinal bundle but a living whole), the medullary cord of that Theology is the Faith of the Undivided Church of the Œcumenical Councils.

To persuade a Baptist to agree to treat the Baptism of Infants or an Independent to treat Episcopacy as matters of secondary importance may conceivably be easier than squaring a circle. The asking the Eastern-

[1] The Orthodox Communion is reckoned at 140 millions of souls. There are very few Papalists (Uniates or others), and, except in Russia, practically no dissenters, in the Orthodox nations.

Orthodox to-day to recede from Nicaea II to Chalcedon would be no less egregious than to propose Union to the Jews on the basis of the Messiahship of Jesus or to the Papalist on that of the autocephalicity of local Churches.

Not, of course, that any Eastern-Orthodox would admit any difference between the Faith of the Fifth Century (or for that matter of the First Century) and the Faith of the Ninth Century.

His case is neither more nor less than that the Faith as he holds it is the Faith of the earliest ages. For him the vital necessity of Episcopacy to the existence of the Church, the sacerdotal powers and office of the Priesthood, the Real Presence, the propitiatory character of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Invocation of Saints, the Seven Sacraments, the supremacy of the Œcumenical Councils as infallible[1] organs of the Christian Society and so forth, are as much fundamental to the Faith of Chalcedon as the dogmatic statements of the Creed of which that Council made the affirmation the duty of every Christian.

"You cannot," the Eastern-Orthodox tells us, "pick and choose what you will believe. The Church is the organism of Faith and Love. The Œcumenical Faith is its great unifying tradition, a deposit committed to the saints once and for all by Christ Himself and safeguarded by the infallible working of the Holy Spirit in the whole body of the Church. It is to be accepted not because of its logical warranty but because not to hold it in its entirety is to break the unity of the Christian Brotherhood."

If you reply *nego majorem*, he will tell you kindly and firmly that you and he are both the poles asunder and that while it is always good to exchange views charitably, care must be taken by both of you to avoid a logomachy.

[1] On the Orthodox terms for Infallible and their contents see below, p. 81.

The position of one or the other must be charged fundamentally before an approximation between you and him is possible.

On the other hand, if he find you, as the Eastern-Orthodox say, "near to the bosom of Orthodoxy,"[1] that is to say with an inclination to accept its fundamental, i.e., the Faith of the first nine centuries, or even sympathetic to its genius, you will be surprised at his easiness[2] on the very matters on which popular misconception might have led you to expect him to be stiff.

That misconception is in the first instance due to the skill with which from the beginning Papalist writers have obscured the main issue by presenting the Filioque and similar banners of controversy as *per se* the cause of the Great Schism, whereas the objection to them is independent of their theological or other correctitude and is that they are "innovations"[3] on the Œcumenical order of the first nine centuries.[4] It is continued, however, through the extraordinary and altogether vicious delusion by which most Anglicans appear to be possessed, viz :—that the right way to obtain a summary of Orthodox Theology is to deduce it from the Fathers of the first five centuries and not to read one or other of the many able, exhaustive and mutually consistent, treatises of Eastern-Orthodox theologians of to-day.

Some excuse may be found for this amazing superstition on the part of the ordinary Anglican.[5]

But there is none for an expert in patristics, however great his knowledge and authority, to proceed to formulate conclusions upon the beliefs of the Orthodox or

[1] Androutsos, p. 5. *εἰς τοὺς κόλπους τῆς Ορθοδοξίας.*

[2] That this easiness is not an inconsistency will be evident from a perusal of chapter ii.

[3] *καινοτομίαι*

[4] *Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople*, p. 53, *et passim.*

[5] The only comprehensive survey of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches in English with which I am acquainted is a book by the Papalist, Dr. Fortescue, which, apart from its mordant hostility to Orthodoxy and from its propagandist objective, distorts and obscures alike its history and principles.

to derive arguments from them, without, for example, thorough first hand knowledge of their five Symbolic Books,[1] the Councils they held in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, the important encyclicals and letters of their modern Patriarchs, their catechisms and so forth. None the less, not only has the author of more than one book dealing with purely Anglican controversies in recent years strengthened his case by a false analogy with the Eastern-Orthodox but, at least in the past, for lack of an equipment so simple and so easily acquired, many of those who have discussed Reunion with the Eastern-Orthodox, appear to have fallen into the characteristic Western error of imagining that the main difficulty in its path is to be found in the Filioque and similar questions and that an agreement can be reached by both sides accepting ambiguous and equivocal formulae buttressed by quotations from the Fathers. Whereas, a cursory glance through a book such as Syropoulos' History of the Council of Florence[2] or of the Patriarch Jeremiah II's "Answers to the Lutherans of Wurtemburg," would have taught them that while the unconditional withdrawal of the Filioque, unless motived by a will to adhere to the Faith of Nicaea II, would be but a small step towards Reunion, the acceptance of that Faith would make an adjustment in such matters as the Filioque relatively easy.[3]

There is, indeed, no more ridiculous mistake than that of the hackneyed and untrue statements that the Eastern-

[1] See Appendix i.

[2] It is precisely the habit of proposing terms which by their ambiguity cover fundamental differences which has made some Eastern-Orthodox include the Anglicans in the accusation of "treachery" wherewith they charged the Papalists of the Fifteenth Century. There is a world of warning in Creyghton's title to his edition of Syropoulos' account of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, *Vera Historia Unionis non verae.*

[3] "At the close of the Conference the presiding Bishop, the Bishop of Kholm, authorized me to tell my audience at my lecture in the evening that, though the Russians and the English differ in the wording of their respective formulas, yet the Conference had, after hearing explanations, concluded that the two Churches are agreed as to the substance of the teaching concerning the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost." *Puller's Continuity of the Church of England*, p. xiv.

Orthodox Churches are "petrified" or that they are set to impose Eastern customs on the West. In regard to the fundamental of the Faith they are, of course, inflexible. Moreover, the very principle of Œcumenicity[1] compels them to press equally for obedience on the part of all Christains both to the canonical decrees and to the directions of the Œcumenical Councils, unless, and it is an important proviso, those decrees or directions are changed by general consent.[2] But apart from these limitations, they are both constrained by their principles and are inspired by their genius of toleration and charity to allow others the fullest liberty.

It is thus that in regard even to the Filioque itself an agreement is not impossible. In the face of Rome they could not but demand that we should receive the Creed in the form that Chalcedon promulgated it. On the other hand, they are not constrained to challenge our having any number of local credal forms we think fit and could admit our right to the use of the Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Creed with the interpolation as a particular Creed of our own as often as we desire. Other matters, such as our mode of Confirmation, our Liturgy and our Rite of Ordination, our not communicating infants, every item indeed in the long list to which they have at times taken exception, they would, I am convinced, consider to come under the governing canon of their "Great Patriarch and Theologian," Photius,[3] "In cases where the thing disregarded is not the Faith and is no falling away from any general and catholic decree, different rites and customs being observed among different people, a man who knows how to judge rightly would decide that neither do those who observe them

[1] See below, Appendix III.

[2] The Œcumenical Patriarchate, e.g. has recently agreed *pro hac vice* to the re-marriage of the war-widowed clergy of Serbia in spite of the Canon of Nicaea I.

[3] Œcumenical Patriarch, 878-886.

act wrongly, nor do those who have not received them break the law."[1]

The measure, however, of their concession in such things is naturally decided by the attitude which those, with whom they have to deal, adopt towards Orthodoxy. Towards Rome they are obdurate. For Rome formally demands the abandonment of their fundamental position and uses all her strength to proselytize them. If we Anglicans force the issue by making an equivalent demand —i.e. if we propound terms of Intercommunion which embody our fundamental and ask them to accept it as an alternative to their own, we shall invite them *ipso facto* to be equally obdurate to us. In other words we shall practically and effectually tell them that there is an end of the undefined but none the less real, if almost intuitive, mutual agreement by which, in these last thirty years that have been so rich in result, we have tried to draw near to them, and they to us, by cultivating and studying each other, by finding the good in each other and by forging links of spiritual friendship and intimacy wherever and whenever opportunity showed itself.

That on both sides the avoidance of the formal discussion of formal Terms of Reunion[2] as only remotely possible and concentration upon the preparation of its *terrain* by many years of sympathetic and brotherly intercourse were assumed as the necessary, the only profitable and the right line of approach, is, I think, evidenced for example by the policy pursued by Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury and by the writings of Mr. W. J. Birkbeck.

No Anglican has probably ever been possessed of greater or more acute knowledge of the Eastern Churches

[1] Photius, Epistle iii. §6, addressed to Pope Nicholas.

[2] Mr. Riley's introduction to *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, chapter i, contains some admirable criticism of the document which the Bishops of England sent to the Russian Synod in 1889.

than the former, who was also endowed with the statesman's *flair* in a singular degree. I have read most of his public utterances on the subject very carefully for the purpose and have found no passage in which he even suggests Terms of Reunion. In view of the responsible position which he held and of the fact that he might almost have been described as officially charged with the care of Anglican relations with the Eastern-Orthodox, the caution with which he approached them was as remarkable as his eagerness. As far as I know, the most that he advocated was the establishment of very friendly relations, such as a mutual provision for burial and the like.

Mr. Birkbeck, whose premature death in 1917, like that of Bishop Wordsworth in 1910 and of Bishop Collins[1] in 1912, has been an inestimable loss to our movement, was able to speak with greater freedom and never left any doubt as to his mind, the decision of which is shown unmistakably in these passages taken almost at random from the invaluable collection of his utterances made by his friend, Mr. Riley. "All doctrinal questions are as nothing compared to a desire to be at one on both sides and this cannot truly exist as long as we are ignorant of one another. . . . Although, as I have said, the first thing to be gained is 'a kindly affection one to another with brotherly love,' I am far from saying it is the only or even the most difficult thing. It is the purest delusion in the world to think that Reunion will ever be brought about by dogmatic compromise, or by avoiding the frank discussions of first principles. . . . The Orthodox Church, however much she wishes and even prays for Unity, does not believe in undenominational Christianity, and will never play the part of poor Gretchen in Goethe's *Faust*, who at first protested against her lover's heterodoxy,

[1] A remarkable oration pronounced at his funeral by the Archbishop of Smyrna is given in Eirene, 1911, i. 6, p. 5.

but when he clothed his religious ideas in certain specious phrases, ending—

> Happiness, heart, love, God,
> I have no name for it—Feeling is all!
> Names are but sound and smoke,
> Dimming the glow of heaven"

replied that she was perfectly satisfied, and heard much the same thing from the parson in Church on Sundays—

> Nur mit ein Biszchen andern Worten,

i.e. 'only with a slightly different way of putting it.' This sort of thing will never do for the Holy Eastern Church."[1]

Or again, in a paper read at the Pan-Anglican Congress in 1908, taking these words which Philaret,[2] the famous Metropolitan of Moscow wrote in despair on the breakdown of negotiations for Intercommunion between Americans and Russians, "How greatly to be desired is the Intercommunion of the Churches. But how difficult it is for a movement, started with that end in view, to wing its flight with the desire pure and simple of arriving at the truth—a desire altogether free from any bias or partiality towards preconceived opinions," he wrote, "as in the 'forties . . . so now in the 'sixties, the Easterns found Intercommunion between the American Church and themselves impossible as long as the two had different faiths and different symbols of faiths. The concessions demanded of the Easterns had practically amounted to a denial of the Œcumenicity of the Seventh General Council, and the relegation of Eastern teaching in regard to the Eucharist and other Sacraments, the Communion of Saints, and other vital points which they hold to be of the essence of the Church's faith and life, to the category of doubtful opinions. It meant to them the abandonment of their own position, and the substitution of the position of

[1] Riley's *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, pp. 92, 93, see also e.g. pp. 98, 230, 354, etc.
[2] Philaret, *Opinions and Extracts*, v, p. 696.

one school of thought in the Anglican Church, friendly indeed to the Easterns, but formulated in terms sufficiently vague not to exclude other Anglican schools of thought with which they had but little in common."[1]

And again, "Reunion is still very distant; quite beyond the range of practical politics for the present. Let us first understand one another. That will at least be one step, and a very great step, gained towards the cause which we all have at heart."[2]

Mr. Birkbeck knew the Russian Church as no other Englishman has known it. I am convinced that when transferred to the Greek Church his views of the Russian attitude is equally just.

There are ardent minds which are not unnaturally intolerant of his slow, patient policy of frankly recognizing that Reunion is impossible either until the Eastern-Orthodox restate their fundamental of the Faith of the Ninth Century or until we find another than that which appears to be our present maximum approach to it.[3] The great hope of Home Reunion makes many of our leaders anxious to establish a logical and fixed platform[4] to which not only Non-episcopal bodies but also the great historical Churches of the East and West may be invited to meet together in a wholly united Christendom. While disclaiming any right to express an opinion as to whether practical wisdom or practical charity should approve of any attempt at the present moment to define what is the Anglican maximum or minimum of *credenda*, I venture to be confident that both forbid such a definition being obtruded upon the Eastern-Orthodox. In this con-

[1] Riley's *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, p. 275.

[2] The same, p. 98.

[3] "He would be a bold man who would say that even yet the time has come to enter upon formal negotiations with the Easterns," Riley's *Birkbeck*, p. 228.

[4] Such "Suggested Terms of Intercommunion" were published in the *Christian East*, September, 1920. Admirable though they are, and far though they go in their will to meet the Eastern-Orthodox, I have no hesitation in saying that their formal presentation would end the present *rapprochement*.

nection it should be remembered that while the Easterns are uncompromising in their claim that the Faith of the Ninth Century is both the Faith of the Apostles and the only possible or right basis of Reunion, they are quite ready to examine their own Faith and to test whether, as they contend, it be identical with the standard to which they appeal. It was not as a challenge of controversy but in real humility that the Church of Constantinople told the Papalists in 1895 that "the Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Church of Christ is ready heartily to accept all that which both the Eastern and Western Churches unanimously professed before the Ninth Century, if she has perchance perverted or do not hold it."[1] Bearing in mind that the one thing hateful to Eastern-Orthodox Theology is the putting syllogisms together for the devising new dogmas from old, and also that the contents of many of their doctrinal statements and terms prove on examination to be very different to those which Western Theology leads us to expect,[2] it is my own belief that the process of conference, however slow, will bring us in the end to find that the Eastern view of the Faith of the Ninth Century is not far different from what our middle school of thought would estimate as of the Fourth or Fifth Century.

To realize, however, the wrongness and futility of attempting to arrange Terms of Union between us and them until by such a process or some change on our side the situation has been altered radically, is not to be "far more Orthodox than the most Orthodox."[3]

It is, indeed, a strange circumstance that, while many of our leaders who write and speak of the Eastern-Orthodox seem to labour under the strangest misinformation about them, the Eastern-Orthodox understand the Anglican Churches very well. For instance this refer-

[1] *Answer of the Great Church*, p. 25.
[2] e.g. see below p. 81, on the Infallibility of the Œcumenical Councils.
[3] Headlam, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 295.

ence in the Epistle of the Russian Holy Synod to the Patriarch of Constantinople is not only very kindly but very shrewd and very well informed in its estimates, "The Anglicans assume a somewhat different attitude towards Orthodoxy. With rare exceptions they do not aim at the perversion of Orthodox Christians[1] and upon every occasion and opportunity strive to show their respect for the Holy Apostolic Eastern Church, admitting that she, and not Rome, is the true conservator of the traditions of the Fathers, and in union and agreement with her seeking for a justification of themselves (i.e. for their own position). Love and goodwill cannot but call forth love on our side also and nourish in us the good hope of the possibility of Church Union with them in the future. But here, also, much still remains to be done before that it will be possible to talk of any definite step in one or other direction. And, first of all, it is indispensable that the desire for Union with the Eastern-Orthodox Church should become the desire not only of a certain fraction of Anglicanism (the "High Church") but of the whole Anglican Community, that the other purely Calvinistic current which in essence rejects the Church, as we understand her, and whose attitude towards Orthodoxy is one of particular intolerance should be absorbed in the above pure current, and should have its perceptible, if we may not say its exclusive, influence upon the Church policy and in general upon the whole Church life of this Confession which, in the main, is exempt from enmity towards us. On our side, in our relations towards Anglicans, there ought to be a brotherly readiness to assist them with explanations, an habitual attentiveness to their best desires, all possible indulgence towards misunderstandings which are natural after ages of separation, but, at

[1] Happily Anglican authorities have always consistently set their face against the proselytization of the Eastern-Orthodox; see especially Bishop Blyth's action at Jerusalem, *A.E.-O.C.U. Report*, 1908, p. 21.

the same time, a firm profession of the truth of our Œcumenical Church as the one guardian of the inheritance of Christ and the one saving ark of Divine Grace."[1]

Before passing from this preliminary and necessary recognition of the danger of being in a hurry about Reunion, it will be well to note two things carefully. In the first place the Eastern-Orthodox have passed through no phase analogous to our Reformation and there is not the smallest symptom that they ever will.

The objectives of the so-called Reform movements which have taken place, as of the Reform tendencies which are now manifesting themselves among them have had reference to matters of discipline,[2] rather than to matters of Faith.

It would not be rash in my judgment to hazard the confident statement that no Eastern-Orthodox bishop could be found who would even consider the possibility of Orthodoxy shifting its fundamental.

It is probable, indeed, that, especially if their relations with the Anglican Churches be strengthened, the Eastern-Orthodox will set themselves to appropriate the scientific methods and the real gains which in England have enabled us to reconcile the sharper conflicts between Religion and Science, and will thus bring themselves into harmony with modern Life and Thought without forsaking their fundamental and sacrificing or compromising the principles for which they stand. They are not bound by legalistic decisions such as bind the Papalist and are free of "the dead hand."

The one thing against which some of us need to take warning is the temptation to believe that a "liberal" school of thought could be created among them. Orthodoxy is a unity and a life. When and where it moves, it must move *en masse* and it can only move

[1] *Russian Letter*, p. 16.

[2] e.g. the question of marriage reform, of the relation of Church and State, the translation of Scripture into modern vernacular, etc. In Russia there have been more challenges to the Tradition of the Faith than in the other Orthodox lands.

by its own laws. The alternative to its doing so on its own fundamental principle is that it should break up and be succeeded by forces such as have present dominion in Russia.[1] Accordingly there could be nothing more futile—or more criminal—than for Anglicans to imagine that interference with the internal affairs of the Eastern-Orthodox could be effective. It would be better to adopt the American policy of open proselytization[2] and to have done with it.

Secondly, and on the other hand, the Eastern-Orthodox have no will to see our own divisions brought to the point of schism. They desire and must desire that we should move towards their own position and that in doing so we should become of one mind, both among ourselves and with them. That is in the very principle of Œcumenicity which is the principle of Orthodox life. But they would find no gratification in seeing a section of the Anglican Church break off and form an English Western-Orthodox Church. Dr. Headlam is right, I am sure, in saying that the Union to which they look forward "would be not a Union mainly between themselves and us, but with a far larger body

[1] I do not mean that Bolshevism has dethroned Orthodoxy in Russia. On the contrary, the Russian nation seems to be unchanged, witness the American, Mrs. Sheridan's diary of her Moscow visit, "To enter the sacred gateway which leads to the Red Square it was necessary, in pre-revolution days, for men to pass uncovered. A tablet has now been inserted in the wall engraved, 'Religion is the opiate of the people.' . . . As for the people they seem to disregard it, to judge by the many who cross themselves as they pass. The shrine seems to be always full of devotees."—*The Times*, November 24th, 1920.

[2] No finer spirit of service has ever been shown, and no more valuable educational work has ever been done than by those who founded Robert College on the Bosphorus or the medical missions and schools throughout the Turkish Empire. Unhappily, however, the atmosphere of those institutions has too often been one of narrow and supercilious bigotry towards not only the Eastern-Orthodox Church but towards the Assyrian, Armenian and the West Syrian Churches. Not only the American Missions but also British Missions, even the Quakers, have aimed, not at strengthening the indigenous Christianity of the Near East, but at transforming it into the pattern of Western Protestantism. The Papalists, of course, have done the same for many centuries. In consequence, Eastern Christianity has been driven back upon itself and the educative influence which Western Christianity might have had upon it has been vastly weakened. If it has not been altogether nullified it is thanks to the sympathetic prohibition of proselytization, which the Anglican hierarchy, and especially the present Archbishop of Canterbury, has laid on Anglicans.

of Christians. As one of them expressed it to me, 'What we do desire is a great union of all Christians against the power of materialism.' "[1]

Almost without exception those of their hierarchs and theologians, with whom I have conversed, have declared that it would be far better to their mind to wait until we can unite with them as a nation than for a relatively small body to secede to them and so create an isolated Orthodox Community in England. Their instinct, native and acquired, gives them a horror of proselytization.

Again, if they are in no hurry to forsake their principles in order of secure Reunion, it is not that they fail to realize the importance of adapting themselves to modern conditions or the great strength which Union with English Christianity would give them for that mission of converting the Moslem world to which they must soon address themselves, and of which they are the obvious and hereditary, as they will be the fittest, instructors. It is rather that they have a long vision born of their charity.

Professor Alivisatos, who accompanied Archbishop Meletios of Athens, in 1919, to England and America as an expert theologian, writes, " The ancient authority of our Church joined to the religious life adapted in new scientific methods by the Anglican Church will constitute a great totality and will accomplish great things in the mission of Christianity to the coming generations. This ecclesiastical totality will become the centre round which should be gathered all the Christian forces, dispersed and separated in the world so as to constitute the unity which our Lord predicted."[2]

No fact, indeed, is more salient than that in working for Reunion the end for which, in Professor Alivisatos' words, the Eastern-Orthodox are working, is not the

[1] Headlam, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 314.
[2] *Christian East*, vol. i., no. 3, 1895, p. 129.

triumph of the controversialist or the conquest of the proselytizer, but the accomplishment of the "mission of Christianity." The same eager sincerity of motive which, in the Lambeth Encyclical of 1920, Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures, the utterances of the Mansfield Conference, and the words of the leaders of every school or denomination of British Christianity, whether or no it persuades our judgment, fires our evangelistic instinct, is apparent in our Eastern-Orthodox brethren. To them, as to us, Reunion is no problem of opportunism. They do not desire it simply in order to protect themselves against materialism or against their secular enemies. The question for them is not even the establishment of communion and of a common life and faith with their fellow Christians and the ending of a thousand years old schism. It is the massing of the forces of all who love the Christ for the assertion of His full dominion in the lands which are called Christian and for the subjugation of the heathen and the infidel to His rule. They do not stop at asking themselves how, while Christians are divided into a hundred rival sects, the world can be won to the Gospel of Brotherhood. They go on to ask, "If Christians spoke with one heart and preached the Gospel with one voice what power could withstand the victory of the Cross?"

No one who has mixed freely with the Eastern-Orthodox can doubt for a moment that to secure Christian Reunion for the sake of Christ they will make any possible sacrifice. Pride will not prevent them re-examining their position on any matter or making any concession and admission that will not involve the loss of a principle to lose which would be to lose everything.

Though Bishop Weldon probably misjudged the nature of any changes which are taking place among them, *mutatis mutandis* one of them might have used these words with which he ended a notable sermon at Bristol in May 1920. "As I cast my eyes into the

remote future, I see as a vision one great Evangelical Catholic Church of England, established or disestablished, that is a minor question, a Church uniting in itself bodies of all who profess and call themselves Christian within the widest line of Christian comprehensiveness. Then when our Church is a truly national Church, it may be possible to approach with full authority the Orthodox Church or Churches of the East. These Churches are changing their spirit; they are giving up the old narrow forms of government,[1] and the time may come, after many days, after many years, after many centuries, when all Christendom outside the Church of Rome, will be federated as one united Church presenting to the world a majestic unity such as the Church of Rome herself in the days of her highest authority never aspired to possess."

It would be easy to demonstrate that "the widest line" which the Eastern Orthodox can contemplate as the circumference of the circle has not the same extended radius which in his large heartedness Dr. Weldon projects, but it is, I think, at least as easy to show that their circle and his are concentric.

Reunion with them is a vastly more hopeful matter than with the Church of Rome. They make no demand upon us for submission to them, but challenge the investigation of the scientific historian. Our theory of Christian polity is in no way incompatible with theirs. Indeed, our own defence has always been strengthened by "an appeal from the Tiber to the Bosphorus." They have no will to ask us to make it tally in detail with their own. The one thing needful for our Union with them is that we should confess the same Faith as themselves and should be united among ourselves.

In this chapter I have endeavoured, perhaps at too great length, to show that until at least Anglican Church-

[1] I do not understand what the preacher meant by this.

men—I had almost written English Christians—can agree on what is the fundamental of their Common Faith and until their essentials are found to be identical with those of Orthodoxy, it would be premature to attempt negotiations for formal Reunion.

Much labour, much study, above all much love and goodwill must be lavished, many passing set-backs and disappointments may have to be experienced before the hoped-for harvest is ripe. The time assuredly is not yet full. But in the meanwhile there is, I believe, a way in which the event may be hastened, and which, without risk of those disasters which almost invariably result from swift and sudden efforts to accomplish equivocal compromises, may both reveal and intensify the unity in Christian zeal and charity that already exists between the Eastern-Orthodox and ourselves.

I will try to make what I mean clear in my next chapter, and to show what bearing Professor Androutsos' invitation had upon its possibility.

CHAPTER II

ECONOMY

"WHEN the Unity of the Church was lawlessly and unlovingly rent by the Western Church, the more so inasmuch as at the same time the East was continuing its former friendly intercourse, and submitting to the opinion of the Western Synods the Canons of the Second Council of Nicæa, each half of Christianity began a life apart, becoming from day to day more estranged from the other. There was an evident self-complacent triumph on the side of the Latins; there was sorrow on the side of the East, which had seen the dear ties of Christian brotherhood torn asunder—which had been spurned and rejected, and felt itself innocent. All these feelings have been transmitted by hereditary succession to our time, and more or less, either willingly or unwillingly, we are under their power. Our time has awakened better feelings; in England, perhaps, more than anywhere else, you are seeking for the past brotherhood, for the past sympathy and communion. It would be a shame for us not to answer your proferred friendship; it would be a crime not to cultivate in our hearts an intense desire to renovate the Unity of the Church; but let us consider the question coolly, even when our sympathies are most awakened. *The Church cannot be a harmony of discords: it cannot be a numerical sum of Orthodox, Latins and Protestants.* It is nothing if it is not perfect inward harmony of creed and outward harmony of expression (notwithstanding local differences

in the rite). The question is, not whether Latins and Protestants have erred so fatally as to deprive individuals of salvation, which seems to be often the subject of debate—surely a narrow and unworthy one, inasmuch as it throws a suspicion on the Mercy of the Almighty. The question is whether they have the truth, and whether they have retained the ecclesiastical tradition unimpaired. If they have not, where is the possibility of unity?"[1]

So Khomiakoff wrote to Palmer in 1846. Much has happened since then. The Eastern-Orthodox World has come to close quarters with the modern Western World, which itself has changed immeasurably. In the Anglican Churches the divergent tendencies, which were manifested eighty years ago, have been developed and emphasized. Where in those days a few thousand "Puseyites" would have timidly subscribed a declaration such as I have appended below,[2] hundreds of thousands of Anglo-Catholics are to-day eager to declare the sacerdotal and sacramental system of the ancient universal Church to be the ground-work of their religious life. Our other schools of thought, however, have moved in their own directions so that the contrasts among us are sharpened and an ever-increased realization of the Church's need and of our mutual will for unity have alone made the centripetal forces in Anglicanism dominate the centrifugal.

Most of us, indeed, would probably reject Khomiakoff's phrase, "a harmony of discords," as inapplicable to ourselves. But as a Communion we are certainly no more able to satisfy his postulate of unity in faith than were our forbears in 1846.

If, therefore, he could write again in 1920, it is certain that he would feel constrained to warn us with no less plainness than he warned Palmer that Union is possible

[1] Riley's *Birkbeck*, pp. 68 and 69. The italics are mine.
[2] See Chapter IV.

only where there is Unity of Faith. In other words, he would tell us that negotiations for formal Reunion would be futile at present. He would also certainly agree with Professor Androutsos that since to the Orthodox mind it is impossible to recognize any Christian Community which is not at Unity with the Orthodox as to the fundamentals of the Faith, and, therefore, in consequence is impossible to accept the Sacraments of such a community as valid *per se*, no formal authorization of Intercommunion with us could be considered by the Eastern-Orthodox Church as a whole or by one of its local churches.

None the less, it is also certain that he would perceive in 1920 a hundredfold greater reason for not repelling our "proffered friendship" and for encouraging our search "for the past brotherhood" and "the past sympathy and communion," than he discovered in 1846.

Apart from the greatly-increased intercourse and friendship between the members of the two Communions and apart from the practical marks of sympathy exchanged between their leaders, such as the energetic and unfailing support and sympathy given since the Armistice by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Œcumenical Patriarchate in its struggle to protect its people and its rights against the Turks, many striking acts of spiritual intimacy between Anglicans and Eastern-Orthodox have occurred, which cumulatively are of the first significance.[1]

[1] During the printing of this book, the Τοποτηρητής (Dorotheos, Metropolitan of Brusa), who, by the chaos in Turkey preventing an election to the Œcumenical Throne, exercised the Patriarchal office, visited and died in London (March 18, 1921). This utterance made by him is worth careful reading, "A chief motive of our journey . . was our ardent desire to make the personal acquaintance of the leaders among the clergy of our sister church of England, and above all that of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has always manifested sentiments of evangelical sympathy and love towards our own Church in her sufferings through the persecution of her children. I thank him and them and pray with all my heart that their goodwill may prove another link between the two Churches and will help to bring about their union upon that one corner-stone which is ever our Lord." At the time of his visit, the *Locum Tenens* was, of course, the acting chief bishop of the whole Eastern-Orthodox Communion. Its taking place—the only precedent for a visit to the West being that of the tragic attendance by Joseph II to

Anything like a complete survey of these would require a book in itself. They range from what may be termed semi-official acts of comity and amity, and from semi-official acts of co-operation, to the personal and private acts of individuals who, in their own necessity or led by the spirit of fraternal charity, have sought Sacramental privileges from the ministers of the other Communion and have been gladly afforded them.

Of the former class of *praxis*[1] we have only to search the newspaper files of the past few years to find a very large number of salient examples, which, although in line with the few precedents set by such visitors to Great Britain as the Greek Archbishop of Syros in 1869[2] or the Russian Bishop Antonius in 1897[3] and by Bishop Collins of Gibraltar and other English prelates in the Near East, have not only been frequent and in rapid succession but have gone far beyond any manifestation of close friendship between the two Communions in the Nineteenth Century.

Thus, to take a few instances, the heads of two autocephalous churches, the Metropolitan of Athens and the Archbishop of Cyprus, both assisted at services in St. Paul's Cathedral on different occasions in 1918 addressed the congregation, and blessed them.

The Metropolitan of Demotikon, who came to London in 1920 as the official delegate of the Œcumenical Patriarch itself to the Lambeth Conference did the

Ferrara-Florence, 1438—is both an historic and symbolic event. Among other incidents of great significance we should specially note the ceremonial investiture of the Archbishop in Lambeth Palace Chapel, on March 10, 1921, by the *Locum Tenens* with the Enkolpion, bearing the Stavropegeion, the emblem of the Œcumenical Throne, that was always worn next his heart by the famous and venerated Joachim III (the gift of which was resolved by the Holy Synod) and by his four immediate successors. The investiture of the Archbishop with such a relic (λείψανον) was more than a delicate compliment. It would have been impossible to make such a presentation to a layman. The Archbishop of Canterbury read the Gospel at the funeral Trisagion in St. Sophia, Bayswater.

[1] i.e. An act taken by a person having ecclesiastical authority, to meet an emergency in circumstances for which there is no prescribed course of action.

[2] The first of our modern Eastern-Orthodox visitors.

[3] Archbishop Antonius attended Evensong at a London Church and blessed the congregation, but did no more. He was criticised for that.

same things at St. Saviour's, Southwark; while on January 9th, 1920, Bishop Nickolai of Žiča[1] preached the first sermon[2] delivered in St. Paul's by a non-Anglican. Archbishop Dimitri of Belgrad (now Patriarch of Jugo-Slavia), the Vicar of Carlowicz, the Bishop of Monastir, Chrysanthus, the Greek Metropolitan of Trebizond, the Archimandrite Serge who has jurisdiction over Russians in Western Europe, the Great Archimandrite Pagonis and the other Greek clergy in England have followed these precedents, which may be paralleled plentifully on the other side. Thus in July, 1920, the Anglican Bishop of Harrisburg was received by the Holy Synod of Constantinople and by the *Locum Tenens* of the Œcumenical Throne, was invited formally to be present at the Liturgy in the Patriarchal Church of St. George of the Phanar and there, having been vested by the *Locum Tenens* in his own Omophorion was asked to take part in the distribution of the Antidoron.[3]

Less public and impressive acts of mutual goodwill and of conjoint worship and prayer have, of course, been multiplied, and their purport intensified, in the very exceptional crisis of the Great War.

Although these have been, in part, the result of the Anglo-Hellenic and Anglo-Serb political entente, their effect has been to add to the ways in which the two Communions formerly evidenced their affinity and close spiritual friendship with each other, so that it is now the custom that Eastern-Orthodox hierarchs on visiting Anglican countries should take part in Anglican public services, not as private individuals, but in their official capacity, and *vice versa*.

At the same time, to a great extent from causes independent of the War, very many *praxeis* have occurred

[1] Now of Ochrida.

[2] Printed in *The Spiritual Rebirth of Europe*, Faith Press, 1920, 2s.

[3] See also Appendix iii. The Antidoron, or blessed bread, is distributed by the clergy after the Liturgy.

whereby, with the consent, and often with the explicit authorization, of their local higher clergy, Eastern-Orthodox lay people have sought and obtained sacramental privileges from Anglican priests, and a certain number whereby Anglican lay people with like sanction have sought and obtained the same from the Eastern-Orthodox.

This class of *praxis* does not, of course, include such an event as the reception from the hands of the Bishop of Maryland of the Communion by Bishop Alexander of Rhodostolos, the bishop in charge of the Greek-Orthodox in U.S.A. at Baltimore in February, 1919, on the opening of the Synod of Washington.[1]

Such *praxeis* are rather in the nature of an extension of the acts of comity and amity between the hierarchs of the two Communions. The fact which is of greater significance for our purpose is that in America, Africa, Australasia and other English-speaking countries, there have been frequent and widespread instances of Eastern-Orthodox lay people, who have settled out of reach of their own priests, asking and receiving Anglican sacramental ministrations, and that their doing so has been authorized by their hierarchs.

For example, these two letters which were printed in the *Northern Churchman*, December 1st, 1919, are worth a careful study.

My Dear Sir,

I write as Metropolitan of the Church of England in the Province of Queensland to ask your wishes, and whether we could further them in the following matter. There are considerable numbers of Greeks in several places of North Queensland who are, of course, cut off from the ministration of the Sacraments according to the rites of the Greek-Orthodox

[1] Father Reddish of Mirfield, who was present, is my informant.

Church. At some of these places, for instance at Ingham and Innisfall, it has been customary for the Greeks to make their Communion in our Church at Eastertide, but no doubt there is a considerable number in other places, who, owing to their isolation, have fallen out of touch with the Holy Communion.

I am wondering whether you would wish our priests in the North of Queensland to take any steps to get into touch with your people, and in that case whether you would think well to send a letter to the heads of the Greek communities where Greeks are numerous, advising them to place themselves in touch with our priests ? Our Bishop of North Queensland, Dr. Feetham, has interested himself in the matter and it is at his request that I write you. You will understand that neither he nor I have any idea of seeking to attach Greeks definitely to our Church. My object in writing this letter is simply to offer to members of the Greek-Orthodox Church the hospitality, if I may so call it, of our Church in the absence of their own means of grace.

I am, my dear Sir, with kind regards,

Yours very truly,

St. Clair Brisbane.

The Rev. D. Maravelis,
Greek-Orthodox Church,
East Melbourne.

The Most Reverend Archbishop of Brisbane.

My Lord,

I have the pleasure to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 15th ult., and I desire very sincerely to thank your Grace and also Dr. Feetham, for your willingness to do such great service to the Greek-Orthodox Church by ministering to those of her children who happen to be without her reach.

I have received an encyclical from the Holy Synod of Athens authorizing me to advise that all members of our Church under such circumstances thould avail themselves of the ministration and Sacraments of the Church of England, and as this so happily coincides with your suggestion that I should communicate with those living in North Queensland, and so advise them, I would most gladly do so, did I know of any established Communities or bodies to whose hands I might write, but unfortunately there are not any such bodies to my knowledge.

The pastor of our Church in Sydney, the Rev. D. Marinakis, within whose province the State of Queensland lies, pays periodical visits to Brisbane, and he may possibly be possessed with greater knowledge regarding Greeks living in the interior of the State.

However, in any case, where your priests desire to and can come into touch with our people, in any attempt they may make to invite them to the ministrations and Communion of your Church, they will be acting with my freely and gladly-given sanction, as I recognize that they will be doing a service both to our people and our Church.

Finally, I beg to assure your Grace that I fully realize and believe that in taking up this matter you have no other object but to afford spiritual help to those isolated men, for the sake and in the Name of the Divine Master, Whom we are all striving to serve.

I am, my Lord,
Yours very faithfully,
ARCH. DANIEL MARAVELIS.

In other parts of the world, according to the information at my disposal, similar understandings, explicit or tacit, exist by which in very many places, Anglican Ministers not only hear the Confessions of Eastern-

Orthodox lay people and give them the Blessed Sacrament but celebrate their weddings and baptize their children, these being as soon as possible brought to their own priest for Chrismation.[1] To undertake a survey of these *praxeis* would cumber this chapter, and to do so exhaustively would be an arduous matter, since even those which are within my knowledge vary from the case of an individual Anglican or Eastern-Orthodox seeking the individual ministration of an individual minister of the other Communion to a carefully-weighed and worded mandate such as that given with the synodical authority of his home church by the Archimandrite Daniel Maravelis.

For my present purpose it will be sufficient to notice their frequent and widespread occurrence, at the same time pointing out two considerations which are pregnant and should be remarked very carefully.

In the first place both classes of *praxis*, which I have described (viz. the ceremonial acts of comity and amity on the part of hierarchs and the admission of Eastern-Orthodox lay people to Anglican sacramental privileges or *vice versa*), have not originated through any negotiation or design. On the contrary they have been the almost spontaneous fruit of the growth of practical goodwill and intelligent sympathy between the two Communions. At each stage of the ripening of the mutual entente, which, if still partial is none the less very cordial, individual Eastern-Orthodox hierarchs have felt able to mark its progress by enhanced acts of ceremonial friendliness and have used unsought opportunities, each to do just the maximum which he felt able, to reciprocate Anglican actions and sentiments. There is no rule and, so far as I know, there has been no discussion among the Eastern-Orthodox as to what they ought to do or may or may not do in participation with us. Thus while all of their bishops who have visited

[1] See Appendix iii.

us recently, have been very ready to do what the Archbishop of Cyprus and the Metropolitan of Athens did, it would not be surprising to find that another bishop felt unable to assist ceremonially at an Anglican Liturgy. Most of their clergy would probably not hold the time ripe for receiving the Blessed Sacrament at an Anglican Altar, but more than one of them has gladdened us by doing so. It is the same with the frequenting of Anglican ministrations on the part of the Eastern-Orthodox laity.

Such *praxeis*, where individual hierarchs authorize them, cannot be reduced to rules. They originate in the natural desire of Eastern-Orthodox lay folk, who are in emergency and who temporarily have not access to their own priests, to avail themselves of Anglican ministrations. That desire has come into being, has increased and has passed into action because of the close *liaison* which has grown up between the two Communions. Some individual Eastern-Orthodox feel that desire and act upon it. Individual hierarchs authorize them to do so. Others do not. The mode of expressing our mutual friendship has become intimate and emphatic because that mutual friendship has become very warm and because some Anglicans have shown a great will to approximate to the spirit of Orthodoxy. If that approximation were to recede and the friendship to cool, their expression would diminish in ratio until it disappeared.

Secondly, the *praxeis* to which I have referred can in no way rightly be taken as entailing Intercommunion between the two Communions.

From the Eastern-Orthodox point of view each is to be regarded as an isolated act of provisional friendship or, in the Archbishop of Brisbane's happy phrase, an individual exercise or acceptance of "hospitality." Except as such they can have no Synodical authorization. The Synod of no autocephalous Church has given any

authorization for them except as provisional and for particular cases. It would appear, indeed, that according to the fundamental rules of Orthodoxy they could receive no such authorization as being permanently and in all cases permissible in principle, either from the general consent of the autocephalous Churches or even from a General Council. For they take place in that chaotic world outside the one True Church of which Orthodoxy can know nothing *per se* and for the regularization of its relations with which it can lay down no fixed rules.

It is thus possible that, without inconsistency, the same authorities by whom they have been permitted should withdraw their permission.[1] It is also only right and wise to point out that there are Eastern-Orthodox of eminence and distinction who consider them as unwarranted.

No logical deduction can, therefore, be drawn from these occurrences and, as has been said, it would be altogether wrong to interpret them as in any way establishing formal Intercommunion between the Eastern-Orthodox and ourselves.[2]

The most that can be concluded is that as the late Œcumenical Patriarch Joachim III told Bishop Collins of Gibraltar, "It is in the quiet increase of informal and unofficial acts of such ministrations that the hope lies for future Intercommunion: the two Churches will some day be moved to recognize officially the fact of their occurrence."[3]

That the close relations between Eastern-Orthodox and Anglicans can find expression in such acts may be

[1] Thus, the Syrian-Orthodox Bishop Raphael of Brooklyn in June, 1910, first authorized his people to receive all the Sacraments from American-Anglicans, and subsequently withdrew the permission. *Report of A. and E.-O.C.U.*, 1909–10.

[2] M. d'Herbigny is quite wrong in writing of Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox relations "en effet elles sont arrivées au point de vue religieux, a une intimité voisine de l'unité." *Études*, vol. 165, p. 150.

[3] See *Report of A. and E.-O.C.U.*, 1908, p. 11.

surprising to those who expect Roman methods of logical deduction to hold good for the Eastern-Orthodox. The fact, however, is that it is those very methods with their consequent tendency to innovation which were the cause of the schism and are repudiated altogether by the Eastern-Orthodox.

"Like the aged President of Magdalene, Dr. Routh," writes Mr. Birkbeck,[1] "when he was asked what he thought of Newman's Essay, she (sc. the Eastern-Orthodox Church) admits of a development of *statement* but not of *doctrine*: that is to say, she may find and authorize a definition of a doctrine held, believed in and acted upon by the Church from the earliest ages, but she does not allow that because certain dogmas held from the beginning seemed to this or that school to lead by a logical process to fresh dogmas, and because the advocates of this new inference may seem able to maintain their arguments against all opponents, the Church has the right to make a new dogma, and to force the result of their syllogistic deductions upon the faithful as an article of Faith."

It is thus perfectly correct to say that as the Papalist Church holds herself to be the One and Only True Church, so also the Eastern-Orthodox Church holds herself to be the One and Only True Church.[2] But in trying to understand the attitude of the Eastern-Orthodox towards those whom they cannot treat as being members of the one Church, it is necessary to get rid of presuppositions with which the records of Western controversy have infected our minds, and to try to think as the Fathers thought in regard to schismatic and heretical bodies.

Her attitude towards those outside her Communion is defined by Khomiakoff, "Inasmuch as the earthly and visible Church is not the fulness and completeness of the

[1] See Riley's *Birkbeck*, p. 94.
[2] For Eastern-Orthodox definitions of the Church, see Appendix i, §1.

whole Church which the Lord has appointed to appear at the final judgment of all creation, she acts and moves only within her own limits and . . . does not judge the rest of mankind and *only looks on those as excluded, that is to say, not belonging to her, who exclude themselves.* The rest of mankind, whether alien from the Church or united to her by ties which God has not willed to reveal to her, she leaves to the judgment of the Great Day."[1]

This attitude would appear to be very different, at least, to that which we are accustomed to attribute to the Roman Catholic. Professor Comnenos put the matter succinctly at one of our unreported conferences with the Constantinople Delegation on July 19th, 1920, when in reply to an enquiry he answered, " Our attitude towards you is not at all that of the Roman Catholics. They profess to know all about you. We profess to know nothing but hope everything."

If, therefore, we enquire as to whether our Sacraments and, indeed, whether the Sacraments of the Papalist, Assyrian, Armenian, and other " heterodox " Churches, are valid, the Eastern-Orthodox are bound to answer that, since there can be no true Sacraments outside the Church, they cannot consider the question of their validity as a *principle* at all.[2]

That is the letter of the law,[3] as Professor Androutsos tells us. If its strictness had no possibility of alleviation there would be an end of the matter, and the Eastern-Orthodox would be logically constrained to ring themselves off from us more impenetrably than the Roman Catholics. For on the one hand the latter appear to have developed a doctrine of the Sacraments by which, provided their Intention be the Intention of the Church and provided their " minister, form and

[1] Khomiakoff, *Essay on the Church*, Birkbeck, p. 194. The italics are mine.
[2] See above, p. 12.
[3] Androutsos, p. 11.

matter"[1] be those ordained, heretical and schismatic Baptism, Confirmation and Orders are valid, at least in principle, impress indelible character, and may not be repeated without blasphemy. Those, therefore, who have received them would logically seem on Roman Catholic principles to be *de facto* members of the One True Church, who by their rebellion have sundered themselves from her but are competent to enter into her Communion simply by an act of Reconciliation. On the other hand, the Eastern-Orthodox Churches have no such rationale of the Sacramental System and hold themselves free in regard to heretical and schismatic Sacraments to treat them at their discretion altogether as null or to recognize them as having more or less value according to circumstances.

"Of course," writes Professor Androutsos,[2] "every perverted and sinful conception[3] of the sacrament or of its special grace reacts of necessity on the sacrament, and can make the Purpose of the Church cease to be apparent by turning the sacrament into something else, or into whatever it is made to be through the outward act. But admitting, for argument's sake, that error concerning the sacrament does destroy its virtue, then

[1] Present day Eastern-Orthodox theologians are not over-enamoured of these categories and prefer to divide a Sacrament into two essential parts, viz. (1) the outward, natural or visible, (2) the inward, supernatural or invisible, i.e. the Purpose of the Church. Thus Androutsos, op. cit. p. 19, note, writes, "This visible part which the ancient fathers called a visible sign (*signum visibile*, *signum sensibile*) and Tertullian called Res, the Westerns from the Thirteenth Century subdivided, according to Aristotle, into *Matter* and *Form*. . . . This distinction, which is also to be found in our own dogmatical and catechetical books, is unnecessary and unreliable, as Friedrich, the Old Catholic, observes rightly in the Revue Internationale de Théologie, 1895, p. 25. Unnecessary because it was unknown to the Undivided Church, and yet did not in any way affect the working of the means of Grace, etc.," and so the Patriarch Dositheos, §15.

[2] ἀντίληψις.

[3] Androutsos, pp. 21–23. He had previously quoted (from Arthur Haddan's *Apostolic Succession*, p. 266) this passage, which he identified with the Orthodox point of view: "The words and acts by which the visible part of the Sacrament is performed are not some magical charm operating merely by syllables and sound, and other physical motions and so mechanically communicating the Divine Grace, but a reasonable representation and an expression of an official transaction by which the Church through her canonical ministers, invested with Divine authority, transmits and purports to transmit the promised special Grace of the Sacrament."

this question, 'Up to what point does a defective conception on the part of a Church nullify the sacrament?' is one which, in default of an authoritative ecclesiastical decision, theologians can solve for themselves in whatever way they wish according to the practice of the ancient Church and their own inclinations and presuppositions; unless, indeed, a Church either intends generally in the acts it employs, to transmit some other thing than what should be transmitted through the sacrament or transforms the rite in question into something else by additions and other changes so as to make the purpose cease to be manifest, in which case it is clear to any one that no sacrament is celebrated. . . . The Western Church undoubtedly accepts the principle that even Jews and heathen are capable of performing valid baptism in cases of necessity; and thus she appears to contradict this doctrine of Intention by placing too much value on the outward act. Indeed, to make the Divine grace so utterly dependent upon the mere words and acts of the sacraments is, to many minds, a precarious principle. Generally speaking, it is inadmissible to make the outward act like some instrument that would act mechanically and communicate mechanically the Divine Grace through the sound of syllables and movements; and to this conclusion they arrive who admit that Jews and heathen are capable of conferring valid baptism."

It is this very different theory of the Eastern-Orthodox as to schismatic and heretical Sacraments which, in contradistinction to the Western, makes a "conditional repetition" of Baptism or Orders a futility. There can be no doubt that strictly the heretic cannot be assumed to have been baptized. Therefore no "conditional rebaptism" is possible. It is the same in regard to the heresiarch. At least very many of their theologians hold that an Orthodox who falls into heresy loses the character of the Sacramental Grace which he

received in Baptism, Confirmation or Orders, and that on his return to Orthodoxy it should be reinvalidated by their repetition.[1] If they do not rebaptize or rechrismate him, the reason may be found in this lucid statement made by Khomiakoff to Palmer in explanation of the variance at different times and in different autocephalous Churches in regard to the "rebaptism" of Papalist converts to Orthodoxy, "All Sacraments are completed only in the bosom of the true Church, and it matters not whether they be completed in one form or another. Reconciliation renovates the Sacraments or completes them, giving a full and Orthodox meaning to the rite that before was insufficient or heterodox, and *the repetition of the preceding Sacraments is virtually contained in the rite or fact of Reconciliation.*"[2]

The fact that the Eastern-Orthodox Churches find themselves free at their discretion either to treat the Baptism, Confirmation and Orders of the same heterodox body as "completed" by Reconciliation or to require their completion by repetition, evidences no inconsistency.

It is explained and justified by the duty of the Church to exercise *Economy*,[3] i.e. her power and authority to act at her discretion in those matters which neither belong to the realm of dogma nor are governed by œcumenical canons. She is "the prudent steward" of the Divine Household and in matters in which her conduct has not been prescribed, her authorities are both at liberty and are bound to act as the good of that Household directs them. To do so is their business in regard to those who are within that Household. It is also their business in regard to those who are in the heterodox and chaotic world outside it.

[1] Such reinvalidation is held to be sufficiently effected by rechrismation, or even by a *libellus fidei*, Appendix iii.

[2] *Birkbeck*, p. 62. See Appendix iii as to modes of Reconciliation.

[3] *Οἰκονομία*. "Economy, which does not displease any intelligent mind": St. Cyril of Alexandria to Gennadius, *M.P.G.* lxxvii, 320.

In the exercise of this function of Economy or prudent stewardship towards the latter, they cannot add to or subtract from, or compromise one iota of the Faith. They cannot diverge from the principles of Orthodoxy. They cannot transgress or suspend the letter of the canonical system. They are bound to avoid any breach of the principle of Œcumenicity. On the other hand, where they do not exceed these limitations, they are bound to exercise it as the good of the Church and charity demand.[1]

It is thus that *economic* acceptances of heterodox Baptism, Confirmation and Orders have been abundant and in certain cases now have synodical authority.[2]

Professor Androutsos sets out the position, and investigates the limitations under which this Rule of *Economy* cannot be applied for such acceptance, in his second chapter[3] which is well worth most careful study.

He begins first by formulating the strict rule, and after pointing out its alleviation by the existence of *Economy*, goes on:

"One thing is certain, and that is that, according to the fundamental principles of Orthodoxy, all who sever themselves from the Church or mutilate the Faith, or in any way fall away from it, lose both the Apostolic Succession in doctrine and in the priesthood.[4] According to the natural view, both the Baptism of apostates as a 'deviation from the Faith'—that is to say, the Baptism of those who have gone astray as

[1] e.g. the solidarity between the autocephalous churches, see Appendix i, § 1, and also Appendix ii.

[2] See the letter quoted above, p. 45.

[3] *Mutatis mutandis* what he says about heterodox Orders is equally applicable to heterodox Baptism and Confirmation.

[4] "Heresy severs a man utterly from the Church," Seventh Œcumenical Council. "Those that have seceded from the Church have not the Grace of the Holy Spirit with them, for the Bestowal of the Spirit ceases by the severing of the order . . . and those that have broken away, having become laymen, have neither authority to baptize nor to ordain, nor yet are they able to pass on to others the Grace of the Holy Spirit from which they themselves have fallen away." St. Basil ad Amphilochium, Epist. 138, §1, Migne, vol. xxxii, 669.

regards the Faith—and still more their Ordinations, are not only legally irregular, but are also wholly invalid and worthless, and such persons are rebaptized and reordained on entering the Orthodox Church, or rather, are first baptized and, if they intend to seek entrance to the priesthood, then ordained.[1] . . . The Church, nevertheless, either considering the expediency of many things, or to avoid some great evils, or through some necessity or other, has frequently by an exercise of Economy simply admitted those who rejoined her by delivering a charge condemnatory of the heresy (libellus) or by laying on of hands, or by sealing with Chrism,[2] or by an act of special dispensation or *Economy*, or by whatever other term this mitigation of the severe canon in these exceptional cases may be called. It is certainly difficult rather than impossible to trace out entirely the *underlying common principle which governs strictness to the letter and Economy*."

After refusing to allow for a moment that there can be any inconsistency between *Strictness* and *Economy*, and asserting that they are parallel, he proceeds further to consider typical primitive cases of the dispensation of Economy, such as the reception of Donatists, Semi-Arians, Arians, and Nestorians, and particularly the action of St. Basil who, on account of "an Economy of many things," received the followers of Zoius and Satorninus[3] but forbade the Nicopolitans to receive ordination from Phronton, of St. Athanasius who rejected the originators of heresies but who accepted in their orders those carried away by force or necessity, of Cyril of Alexandria, who urged Gennadius not to avoid Communion with Proclus "on account of the

[1] He justifies this position by quoting the Apostolic Canons, 46, 47, and 48, Canon 19 of Nicæa *re* the Paulicians, and St. Basil's rejection of Encratite Baptism: Migne, xxxii, 732.

[2] See the note on The Reconciliation of Heretics, chap. ix, §5, of Duchesne's *Christian Worship*, 4th edition, S.P.C.K.

[3] Migne, vol. xxi, p. 670.

economies of the case," " which at times must be strained a little beyond what is necessary," of the Third Œcumenical Council[1] which accepted the Messalian clergy in their Orders, and of the Seventh Œcumenical Council which declared that clergy who renounce their heresy are to be received in their Orders.

Finally he sums up from these examples: " It is quite clear that the rule of Economy has never been dispensed with: but in practice it has been frequently restricted by definite limitations, viz. (1) " Heresiarchs and originators of schism are not accepted in their Orders, and this is absolutely unquestionable "; (2) " those that have mutilated the outward act of the Sacraments where that act has been laid down canonically by tradition, are not accepted."

In regard to these two limitations, he is quite clear that " although there may be certain matters and factors unknown to us to-day which make apostates appear to stand nearer or farther from the Church, and which regulated the Rule of *Economy* in the acceptance of some apostates as persons to be, and of others as persons not to be, rebaptized or reordained, yet on the whole the stringent rule adopted by the chief rulers of the Church, and particularly that of rejecting those persons who set aside the outward canonical act of the Sacrament, although theoretically not binding[2] is, for all that, a proviso which must be accepted absolutely, and a limitation on which no controversy whatever is admissible."

Finally, after stating that " no Œcumenical or local

[1] Nicæa and Constantinople both prescribe different treatment to different heretics.

[2] These words in conjunction with the further passage which I quote from Androutsos and my subsequent quotations from Professor Dyovouniotos make me ask whether the theoretical possibility of the economical recognition of non-episcopalian orders would necessarily be dismissed off-hand by the Eastern-Orthodox as outside the widest scope of Economy and whether, if adopted, the cautious suggestions made by Dr. Headlam in his *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 310–318 would be an absolute bar *per se* to our approach to them. I venture to regret that in those Lectures Dr. Headlam did not set out the rationale of *Economy* as dispensed by the Eastern-Orthodox in these matters.

Council has laid it down, nor is it generally defined, anywhere, how far the mutilation of the outward act of a Sacrament may go without harm and how far, on the other hand, it cannot go without making the Sacrament of Ordination null and void," he arrives at the conclusion that, as "the outward invocation of the Three Persons forms the essential and unchangeable factor in the *economical* acceptance of Baptism," so in Ordination "the outward act—which includes everything that since Apostolic times is assumed as necessary for the due canonical performance of the ceremony—is an essential factor for the valid efficacy[1] of the Sacrament."

It was by the two criteria specified above, i.e. as to heresiarchs and as to mutilation of the outward act, that Professor Androutsos examined the validity of Anglican Orders and finding that they were unimpeachable on the historico-canonical side, formulated the four questions[2] on a satisfactory answer to which, in his opinion, they are capable of *economic* acceptance.

Before closing this chapter and proceeding to discuss whether answers which would satisfy his invitation can be given by us, I should quote from a treatise on the Sarcaments published by Professor Dyovouniotos of Athens in 1913.[3]

"The Church, as holding stewardship[4] of God's Grace, has power by *Economy* to recognize the priesthood and the Sacraments of schismatics and heretics. In the exercise of this *Economy* the Church not only takes into her consideration the general faith of the schismatics and heretics who approach her, and especially both their faith as to the Priesthood and Baptism, and the canonicity of their rite, but also (requires) no breach in their episcopal authority from the time of the Apostles. Thence it is to be observed that by a usage, which

[1] *Ισχύς.*
[2] See above, p. 14.
[3] The translation is my own.
[4] *ταμιοῦχος.*

obtains very frequently, the Church regards as invalid the Priesthood and Baptism of all those schismatics and heretics among whom the Apostolic Succession has failed or has been interrupted, or among whom the Faith in general and especially the Faith concerning the Sacraments or the canonicity of their rite has been perverted, while she accepts the Priesthood of schismatics and heretics among whom the Apostolic Succession has not been broken and among whom neither the Faith in regard to the Sacraments nor the canonicity of their rite has been perverted. It must be borne in mind, however, that, as holding stewardship of the Divine Grace, *the Church is able both to recognize the Priesthood and the Sacraments in general of schismatics and heretics among whom they are not accomplished canonically or the Apostolic Succession has been broken,*[1] and also for reasons which she herself regards as reasonable and necessary, to reject altogether the Priesthood and the Sacraments of schismatics and heretics among whom they are accomplished canonically and the Apostolic Succession has not been broken."[2]

To this passage he appends the following note: "The very important question of Ecclesiastical Economy has not been investigated or defined among us, in detail or authoritatively. The recognition of the Sacraments of heretics by *Economy* can be explained in two ways; either that the Sacraments of those who approach us from among heretics and schismatics are revivified on account of their approach to the Church, or that the Church, as having the stewardship of Grace and being the ruler of the Sacraments, has the power to transform the validity of the Sacraments by establishing the invalid as valid and the valid as invalid. The first of these opinions prevails in the Western Church which distinguishes in the Sacraments between character and grace, and accepts the impress of character through the canonical

[1] The italics are mine.

[2] Ἀνοβουνίωτος, pp. 162–3.

celebration of the Sacraments even among schismatics and heretics. This opinion, however, of the Western Church cannot be received, inasmuch as it contradicts the practice of the Church which regards many of the Sacraments of heretics as invalid and also according to circumstances the same Sacraments as invalid or as valid. The second opinion alone can explain this practice of the Church and for that reason must be received so much the more that it rests upon the theory that outside of the Church the Grace of God does not exist, and that it rejects and refutes the theory of a distinction in the Sacraments between character and grace as being unable to find support in Holy Scripture or in Sacred Tradition."

To the ordinary Anglican reader this Method of *Economy* may at first sight be surprising. The more, however, he reflects upon it, the more it will attract him. It invites him to go behind the mass of legalistic decisions piled up by the Schoolmen and yet leaves him at liberty to profit by their labours. Corollary as it is to the Orthodox fundamental that the Faith is unchanging and unchangeable, it lifts the dead hand from his shoulders and relieves him from the no less heavy weight of the otherwise inevitable logic of the Roman doctrine of Development. It takes him beyond the accumulation of the past eleven centuries and puts him on firm ground in the freedom of the Undivided Church. It is the explanation of the apparently extraordinary conservatism and the apparently extraordinary liberalism of the Eastern-Orthodox, of their unbending rigidity towards heterodoxy[1] and of their readiness to act with practical charity towards the heterodox.

[1] These words of the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar and Hereford, might be taken as an example of the Rule of *Economy* in action, "A minister can accept it (sc. the Lambeth Appeal of 1920) in its general meaning is held by the Conference to be eligible for occasional invitations to our pulpits. . . . With congregations that have definitely pledged themselves to unite with us, we bishops go a good deal further. Although, as a body, we must pronounce it an irregularity, we hold excused any bishop who allows

If in their logic of innovation, Papalism and Protestantism may be recognized as mother and daughter, it is not surprising that, in relation to the heterodox, the former has abolished and the latter has dispensed with, the economical function and power of the Church.

When the English Church restated her position in the Sixteenth Century, the recollection of it had disappeared in the West. If she had recovered it when, in making her appeal to the comciliar principle and in asserting her independence under Christ of all external jurisdiction except that of an Œcumenical Council, she took the same ground as the Eastern-Orthodox, her history and her present day problems might well have been different.[1]

If English theologians appear to their Eastern confrères to be characterized by a certain ego-centricity and particularly by an unwillingness to realize that Orthodoxy can be studied profitably only on Orthodox principles, the impression has some warrant from the general Anglican failure to perceive the bearing of an Eastern-Orthodox recognition of Anglican Orders upon the relations of the two Communions.

members of such congregations to take advantage without question raised, of our administration of the Holy Communion." Lambeth and Reunion, 1920, S.P.C.K. p. 71. Again, on the motion of the Archbishop of York, the Upper House of the Northern Convocation resolved on February 2, 1921, "That a bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers not episcopally ordained, who, in his judgment, are working towards an ideal of union, . . . to preach in churches within his diocese, and to clergy of the diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers."

[1] See quotation from *Damianos*, p. 161.

CHAPTER III

ECONOMY AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

IF Professor Dyovouniotos be right, the Eastern-Orthodox Churches can recognize heretical and schismatical orders theoretically even though these have been conferred uncanonically or without Apostolic Succession.

That is a hard saying which I imagine would not necessarily be accepted by theologians of all the autocephalous churches.

In fact, however, even if undisputed, we may dismiss it from our consideration here; for, while there is not the remotest probability of its being acted upon in any case whatever, only one hesitation prevents most Eastern-Orthodox theologians from recommending that Anglican Ordinations should be placed on a parity for *economic* recognition with Papalist, Nestorian and other such ordinations as they admit to be valid for that purpose.

It is thus that, while of the only two limitations to the *economic* recognition of heretical Sacraments at which Professor Androutsos arrived,[1] the first as to heresiarchs is obviously inapplicable to our case,[2] in regard to the second he found only one doubt which prevented him from concluding that it also did not apply to us. These passages from two distinguished Russian theologians will show that he does not stand alone, but that they arrived independently at much the same conclusion as that at which he arrived. Thus

[1] See above, p. 58.

[2] At worst, it is plain that our succession is as largely through bishops who were not heresiarchs but were carried away into heresy, as that of the Roman Catholic Church.

Professor Bulgakoff of Kiev, whose monograph on the subject of our orders was unknown to Professor Androutsos, wrote in 1898: "Accordingly the question of the Anglican hierarchy at the present is in the following position:

1. Its uninterrupted succession from and its connection with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, thanks to the latest historical investigations, must be acknowledged to be undoubted.
2. It is quite true that this connection is as yet not acknowledged by the Roman Catholics, but already it is not openly rejected in documents which are generally binding upon Roman Catholics (literally 'documents having a general-obligatory significance for Roman Catholics') such, for instance, as the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*.
3. The Anglican Ordinal, in respect to its contents, may be placed among that series of forms of Ordination which are used by those Christian bodies whose hierarchy, notwithstanding their heresy, is admitted by the Roman Catholics to be valid.
4. For the Reunion of the Anglicans with those Christian bodies which have a hierarchy of unbroken Apostolic succession, before all things, the restoration by the Anglicans of the true Faith—that is to say the teaching of the ancient universal Church—is necessary. *If the Church of Christ is a Community, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, of men believing on Him, united amongst themselves by the unity of the hierarchy, the faith, the unity of the hierarchy and of the Sacraments*, then in order that the Anglicans may be reunited with the true Church of Christ, it is indispensable that they should restore their Union with her in the Faith and Sacraments. And if the teaching of the present Anglican Episcopate upon the Sacrament of Orders

turns out to agree with the teaching of the ancient universal Church, this will be a clear proof that Anglicanism has not merely preserved the Apostolic Succession in an outward manner, but that it has not changed the essential nature of that ministry which is indispensable for the Church according to the mind of her Divine Founder and Head. Only then will it be possible to decide the question as to what order of error the errors of the Anglican Church are to be referred; this is to say, whether the gift of the grace of the priesthood has been extinguished within her, or whether this Church still has within her a glimmering of the light of grace, sufficient to enable her Orders to be acknowledged as valid. And so, in order to arrive at a final settlement of the question of the Anglican hierarchy, it is indispensable that the question should be settled of the beliefs of this hierarchy upon the Sacraments instituted by the Lord, to the number of which is to be referred the Sacrament of Orders itself which serves as the means of grace for the planting of the priesthood in the Church."[1]

About the same time Professor Sokoloff of Moscow wrote, "Anglican divines[2] assure us that their Church, in setting forth its teaching about two Sacraments, has only in view to express the idea that these Sacraments have a pre-eminent importance and a visible sign instituted by Christ the Saviour Himself; but that together with these she has always acknowledged, and still acknowledges, that the remaining five are also Sacraments, which, although they have less importance, also necessarily communicate Divine Grace. If this assurance of theirs corresponds with the real facts, the Anglican Church, at her Council, has the full possibility,

[1] *Bulgakoff*, p. 44.

[2] Sc. the Lambeth Conference.

if, of course, she wishes to do so, to declare that she has always believed and still does believe so, and that she confesses it in the hearing of all. By such a declaration that which from the Orthodox point of view is by far the principal hindrance to the recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders would be removed; and, in our opinion as we shall show later on, this hindrance may be shown to be the only one which really exists."[1]

Again, the Report of the Committee appointed by the Russian Holy Synod on Old Catholic and Anglican questions, drawn up in 1904 with special reference to an enquiry by Bishop Tikhon of Alaska, now Patriarch of Russia, as to the reception of an Anglican parish into the Orthodox Church in America, comments on our Ordinal: "In case it should be found necessary to authorize for former members of the Anglican Confession their rite of ordination, it would be desirable to bring into it a clear expression of the Divine institution of the three orders of the hierarchy, of the unconditional necessity of episcopal ordination, and of the power of the priest to offer the bloodless sacrifice."[2]

A comparison of these typical Russian utterances with those of Professors Androutsos and Dyovouniotos quoted above will show, as I have said, that they are of one mind as to the requisite for the *economic* recognition of our Orders. But it will also show that while the former content themselves with an academic investigation, the latter concern themselves with the practical bearings of their conclusion.

This might have been expected from the fact that a difference of attitude, though none of principle, is often to be observed in Russian theologians when contrasted with Greek. Thus, broadly speaking, Russian theologians retain more traces of the influence of those scholastic methods which infiltrated into the Eastern-

[1] Riley's *Birkbeck*, pp. 280–281. [2] *Barnes and Frere*, p. 19.

Orthodox Churches in the Seventeenth Century, and which affected them then to a far greater degree than the Greeks.[1] When we further remember how suspicious the Turks were of any intellectual movement on the part of the latter and in particular the measures they took to repress free intercourse between their hapless Orthodox *rayah* and the subjects of the Tsars, it is surprising, not that Russian Theology should at one time have evinced characteristics of its own, but that, being almost in a world apart from the main tradition, it should not have developed divergently from it. That it did not is a great evidence of the strength of the principle of Œcumenicity.[2]

Thanks to that principle whatever difference exists between Greek and Russian theologians, who have independently examined the question of our Baptism and Orders or of the Baptism and Orders of other Churches, is solely a difference of treatment. The Russian is characteristically inclined to concentrate his attention upon the rite, the intention and so forth of the Sacrament examined and on finding them sufficient to accept them. The Greek, while laying no less stress on such things, is inclined to look at all the circumstances, at the general faith of the Church whose Sacraments are under consideration—especially at its attitude to the Eastern-Orthodox Churches—and so on. Thus, for example, in the Eighteenth Century the Russians

[1] These influences appear to have been largely derived through Eastern students, especially of Uniate colleges in Rome, who on returning to Orthodox countries acceded to Orthodoxy.

[2] The principle of Œcumenicity, i.e. of the oneness in life as in faith of the autocephalous churches, is thus defined in the Russian Epistle to the Patriarch of Constantinople of 1903—"In its own particular life each autocephalous Orthodox Church must always (as indeed it does at present) preserve the memory and consciousness of its union with the other Orthodox Churches and of the fact that only in Communion and agreement with them has it the pledge of truth and of eternal life, or manifests itself as the Church of God, and that, if it has lost this Communion and union, it must perish within as a branch which has fallen away from the vine. May the constant and active introduction into their life and ecclesiastical practice of this principle of Œcumenicity (Vselenskosti), the training of a feeling of its necessity in his ecclesiastical community, be the subject of the special care of the wise representatives of the local churches," p. 13.

remained of opinion that Papalist Baptism and Orders should receive *economic* recognition on the ground that they satisfied the minimum tests and that though, of course, the Russian Church was not bound to accept them, it would be wise and charitable to do so. But in view of the bitter aggression of the Vatican towards the Greek Churches, among which it had been the custom to accept Papalists in their Baptism and in their Orders, these reversed their own action[1] and repeated those Sacraments.

Accordingly it is not surprising that, understanding broadly, as undoubtedly he understood the situation within the Anglican Communion, Professor Androutsos should not have contented himself with a barren academic statement about the *economic* recognition of our Orders but went on to suggest concise and practical declarations which would warrant that recognition.

The position as he found it may be stated thus :—

1. The Apostolic Succession of our Orders appeared to him unbroken and the rite of their administration sufficient, but our formularies and the opinions of some of our theologians, past and present, appeared to him to leave a doubt as to the *Purpose*[2] of the Anglican Churches in conferring them.

2. To remove that doubt, the simplest and obvious method would be an explicit declaration by our Bishops. Whether that were given at a Synod or an informal gathering such as a Lambeth Conference would be relatively immaterial; the *desideratum* being a declaration by those who have authority to speak for the Anglican Churches, the latter would be adequate. He knew, however, that as things were in 1903—of course, they are the same to-day—such a declaration was not in the field of

[1] For a summary of the matter see Appendix iii.

[2] *πρόθεσις.*

practicality and so indicated a method which was less certain but in his judgment was clearly adequate to the case.

3. The declaration he had suggested our Bishops making was not that Anglicans have always held the same doctrine as to Orders as the Eastern-Orthodox or that they all hold it now. What he sought was clear evidence that it is held by a preponderating element in our Communion to-day. If that evidence were forthcoming, he judged that our Orders would be on all fours with Roman Orders and that not only the Greek application of *Economy* but also that of the more juridical Russian[1] would dictate their *economic* recognition. Such a declaration by our Bishops, however, being altogether unlikely, he indicated further an alternative, though less desirable, procedure. He was aware that the Anglican Communion contains that very large active and influential body which he described as "the High Church," and which in its faith approximates very nearly to Orthodoxy. If that body of opinion were to state explicitly that it held the same doctrine in regard to Orders as the Orthodox, he held that it would "solve the question of its Priesthood," or in other words, the Eastern-Orthodox Church would have no hesitation in giving *economic* recognition to our Orders.

In the light of our previous survey of the working of *Economy*, and remembering that the acceptance to be given would not be absolute and as a principle but simply contingent and for the laying down of "solid foundations" for "a rapprochement and true union

[1] As noted above the Russian Church has steadily maintained for nearly 300 years that in spite of Rome's secular and bitter political campaign against Orthodoxy, a broad view of the circumstances warrants the *economic* recognition of Papalist Baptism and Orders, it being right to set off the sufficiency of the rite and the belief in the Priesthood against all other considerations.

with the Eastern Church," we can well understand why Professor Androutsos required more of the "High Church (party)" than his Russian confrères required of the Anglican Episcopate. The latter could commit the Anglican Churches authoritatively. The former could not. Therefore, since the committal would, as it were, be less extensive, it must be intensified and the "High Church (party)" must show a greater approximation to Orthodoxy than would be looked for in the whole Communion.

That is the objective of his fourth question. The first three were formulated in order to elicit a clear statement as to the Priesthood and as to the Sacramental System which depends upon it and with which it is bound up. But a satisfactory reply to them would be possible without any real nearness in Faith to Orthodoxy. He, therefore, added a question inviting an explicit acceptance of the Œcumenical Councils as "infallible[1] organs of the true Church, the declarations of which bind *eo ipso* every particular Church, and accept them always as the true Faith."

Such an acceptance, coupled with the stout historic maintenance by the Anglican Churches of the independence of the local Churches, would prove that a most important stream of opinion in the Anglican Communion holds the Thirty-nine Articles to be a local document, the interpretation of which is governed by and cannot challenge the Œcumenical dogmas of the Church. It would also satisfy him that Anglicans hold the safeguarding of the Faith to be a function of the Sacred Ministry.

And further, from both his reading and personal knowledge of Anglicans, he had reason to be sure that, if it would, our "High Church (party)" could give the assurance which he suggested.

[1] On this term see below, p. 81.

I. To his first question, "*Does it receive the Seven Sacraments?*" most of those historic High Churchmen who are not identified with advanced teaching would certainly answer in the affirmative. There is also a growing tendency among Anglicans of all schools not to boggle at the application of the term Sacrament,[1] to Confirmation and the other four. It is to be noted also that Professor Androutsos does not ask for a statement of a scholastic character, but simply for an assurance that Anglicans accept Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Marriage and Unction of the Sick as Sacraments. Moreover, as will be seen from the passages which I have collected in my first Appendix, he could have no quarrel with our categorising Baptism and the Eucharist as "Sacraments of the Gospel," the object of his question being simply to make sure that, as the Constantinople Delegation told us on July 17th, 1920, we held the other five to be possessed of outward signs instituted by Christ or His Apostles and to convey Grace to the soul of the Faithful.

II. To his second question, "*Does it take Confession as a necessary condition for the remission of sins, and the priestly absolving of sins as included in the authority given to it by the Lord?*" the "High Church (party)" would, I imagine, find no difficulty in framing an answer which, without implying a legal obligation to make confession to a priest, would be fully satisfactory.

III. As to his third question concerning the Eucharist, "*How does it accept the Real Presence of the Lord? and What is the character of the Unbloody Sacrifice?*" there would again be no difficulty on the part of the ordinary Anglican. In his seventh chapter, "On the Anglican

[1] Thus Dr. A. C. Headlam clearly expects not only all Anglicans but all English Christians to accept its application to Orders.

Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," Professor Androutsos was at pains to make it clear that in the first clause of this question he is not asking for a *definition* of the mode of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. On the principles of Orthodoxy the enactment of such a definition is possible, if at all, *only* by an Œcumenical Council, and none of the Seven have formulated one. That for which he asks is a repudiation of inferences drawn from the 28th and 29th of our Thirty-nine Articles, viz. that "there is no change whatsoever in the Eucharist, that none but the faithful partake spiritually of the Lord's Body and Blood and that the Lord's Body is present only in the use of the Sacrament and in the eating thereof."[1] Those inferences he finds at variance with the plain statements of the Fathers and with Tradition, and to be sheer Calvinism. There is no question of our accepting any particular definition of "Transubstantiation," scholastic or otherwise; nor does it matter whether these interpretations of our Articles, to which he draws our attention, are admitted by us. He simply asks for a declaration to remove his doubts and would apparently be satisfied with the Nonjurors' statement in 1716, "Though they believe a divine mystery in the Holy Sacrament, through the Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, whereby the faithful do verily and indeed receive the Body and Blood of Christ: they believe it yet to be after the manner which flesh and blood cannot conceive. And seeing no sufficient ground from Scripture or Tradition to determine the manner of it, are for leaving it indefinite and undetermined."[2]

That for which he must press is a declaration that we believe a *Metousiosis*,[3] "what the fathers term *change, transmutation*," to take place at the Consecration. I imagine that a larger body of Anglicans than belong to the "High Church (party)" would not decline to give it him.

[1] Androutsos, p. 80. [2] G. Williams, op. cit. p. 9. [3] Μετουσίωσις, Androutsos, p. 83.

Before leaving this part of Professor Androutsos' third question it will be worth while to notice that, as has often and disastrously been the case where a theological term has been roughly translated into another language by a term already invested with sharp controversial associations, the rendering of *Metousiosis* by *Transubstantiation*[1] has obscured the Anglican perception of Orthodox Eucharistic doctrine. Thus the Eastern-Orthodox have five so-called Symbolic Books[2] which they regard as authoritative.

In these the word *Metousiosis* appears first in the Greek version of the third, the Confession of Mogila, which is in the form of a catechism and was written with an eye both to the Lutherans and the then active Jesuit proselytization in the Baltic provinces.[3] In his 106th and 107th answers, Mogila wrote, "The Holy Eucharist, or the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the visible species of Bread and Wine: Wherein, really and properly, and according to the Thing itself, Jesus Christ is present," and "In the moments of Consecration of the Holy Gifts . . . the Substance of the Bread and the Substance of the Wine are changed into the very Substance of the very Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. . . . At these words there is wrought a change[4] in the Elements, and the Bread becomes the very Body of Christ and the Wine His very Blood; the species[5] only remaining which are perceived by the sight."[6]

[1] Wherever Transubstantiation appears in this translation of Androutsos, the original is *Μετουσίωσις*.

[2] See Appendix i, p. 117.

[3] The Confession seems to have been first issued in Greek with a Latin translation, and afterwards in Slavonic.

[4] *μετουσίωσις*. The word is never used by the Fathers. It occurs in a letter of Michael Palæologos (d. 1282) to Pope Gregory. Gennadius Scholarius (d. 1460) writes: *μεταβολὴν οὐσίας εἰς οὐσίαν . . . τῶν συμβεβηκότων. ἀμεταβλήτων μενόντων*. Mark of Ephesus, the Patriarch Jeremiah and Metrophanes Kritopoulos do not use it.

[5] *τὰ εἴδη*.

[6] *Catechism of the Eastern Church*, translated from the Russian by Lodvel, 1772, edited by Oveibeck, Baker, Soho Square, 1898—the first Russian theological work published in English.

Expanding Mogila, Dositheus Patriarch of Jerusalem, wrote thirty years later: "In the celebration of this Sacrament we believe our Lord Jesus Christ to be present not typically or figuratively, nor by a greater degree of grace as in the other Sacraments, nor by a bare presence, as some of the Fathers speak concerning Baptism; nor by conjunction, whereby the Divinity is substantially united to the Eucharistic Bread, as the Lutherans foolishly and wretchedly suppose; but truly and really. For the Bread and Wine after consecration are changed, transubstantiated, converted, transformed,[1] the Bread into the true Body of our Lord which was born in Bethlehem . . . the Wine also is changed and transubstantiated into the very Blood of our Lord which, as He hung on the Cross, flowed from His Side for the life of the world. Also the Bread and Wine being consecrated we believe that the substance[2] of Bread and Wine remain no longer but the very Body and Blood of our Lord, under the form and figure[3] of Bread and Wine, that is under the accidents of the Bread. . . . Also, that the Body and Blood of the Lord is broken and divided by the hands and teeth, but by accident only; that is in the accidents of Bread and Wine, under which we also confess them to be visible and tangible."[4]

Then, after dealing with the indivisibility of Christ's Body, with the worship to be paid the Blessed Sacrament, the sacrificial character of the Eucharist and with the Reserved Sacrament, as if realizing that he had gone perilously near to using the methods of Latin Rationalism, he safeguards himself thus: "Nevertheless we do not believe that the word "transubstantiation"[5] perfectly explains the manner by which the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord

[1] μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιοῦσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι.
[2] τὴν οὐσίαν, rather the essence, see Philaret's statement quoted below.
[3] εἴδει καὶ τύπῳ.
[4] G. Williams, p. 157.
[5] Μετουσίωσις.

(for that is altogether impossible, as being to be comprehended by God only; so that he ought to be looked upon as foolish and impious whosoever thinks he can arrive at the full knowledge of this Mystery), but that after Consecration the Bread and Wine are not typically, nor figuratively, nor according to superabundant Grace, nor by communication, nor by the presence of the Divine nature alone of the only-begotton Son of God, changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord. Neither is any accident of the Bread and Wine changed in any manner into an accident of the Body and Blood of Christ; but the Bread is made truly and substantially[1] the true Body of the Lord and the Wine His Blood."[2]

Now though, thanks to the controversial usage of terms such as Transubstantiation, these passages appear much more stark and stiff in English than in Greek, and, though they may have to be defended as perhaps misleading in expression but in no way inconsistent with Orthodoxy, the Eastern-Orthodox have felt uneasy at their approximation in language to scholasticism. It was thus that when the Articles of the Synod of Jerusalem were translated for official promulgation in Russia[3] the passage of Dositheus marked above with a rule was paraphrased thus: "Further we believe that after the consecration of the Bread and Wine, the very Bread and Wine no longer remain, but the very Body and Blood of our Lord under the appearance or form of Bread and Wine. The Body and Blood of our Lord are divided and separated, yet this takes place in the mystery of the Communion only with respect to the species of Bread and Wine throughout which alone they may be seen and touched."[4]

[1] ἀληθῶς καὶ πραγματικῶς.

[2] ibid. p. 159. For the parts of the article omitted see p. 139. I had some doubt as to whether I should not re-translate in order to avoid the use of such words as *substance*, etc.

[3] Though communicated to the Russian Church in connection with the Nonjurors' correspondence in 1721, they were first officially circulated in Russia in 1838, see Blackmore, *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, 1845.

[4] *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, p. 355.

Further, when on the basis of Mogila's Confession, Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, drew up the "Longer Catechism of the Russian Church" in 1837, he was "careful not to commit himself to the alien theological definitions of the West, and especially not to those of the Council of Trent or the Catechism of Pope Pius IX."[1] Philaret, who was also the official translator of Dositheus, in the course of an interview in the 'sixties with the American, Bishop Young, made this significant statement, "The manner of our Lord's presence in the Blessed Eucharist is a mystery to be apprehended by Faith and not a matter to be speculated and dogmatized upon, or to be reasoned about. All definitions or pretended explanations, such as the use of the word Transubstantiation (*Transubstantiziatzija*) are nothing but attempts to penetrate into the mystery, and thereby they overthrow the essence of a Sacrament."[2]

"But," objected Bishop Young, "is not the word transubstantiation used in your Longer Catechism?"

"No, it is *not*. In Russian we say *presuschchestvlénie*,[3] a word corresponding exactly to the Greek *Metousiosis*."

"But it is used more than once by Blackmore in his translation of the Russian Catechism." "In that case the translation is incorrect. We have taken good care that the word should not appear in the Catechism."[4]

The episode is illuminating as well as interesting and brings into relief the fixed principle of Orthodoxy that the teaching of the Undivided Church can receive no addition by fuller definition. At a time when the Western world was creating technical and defined terms, *Metousiosis* was employed by the Greeks as explanatory.

[1] *Guardian*, May 31st, 1897.

[2] See *Priesthood in the English Church*, pp. 54, 55, 1898, S.P.C.K.

[3] This word and not *Transubstantiziatzija* appears in the Russian Version of Mogila.

[4] The interview was first published in the *Tzerkovny Viestnik*, March 18th, 1897. Birkbeck appended a note to a translation in the *Guardian*, May 12th, 1897, "*presuschchestvlénie* is the exact Slavonic equivalent of the Greek *Metousiosis*, the Slavonic *suschchestwo* philologically corresponding not to *substantia* but to *ousia* (essentia) and being formed in just the same way from *suschi*, present participle of the verb *bytj* to be."

It was translated inexactly into Slavonic by transubstantiation (borrowed from Latin), a term which already had one or more meticulous and novel definitions. The effect was to throw back and to invest the Greek word, too, with the associations of its inexact equivalent. There was "danger of the irruption of the coarse metaphysics of the schoolmen with their self-made and even, from a philological point of view, unnatural term, transubstantiation."[1]

What was to be done? The term transubstantiation which was now linked up with *Metousiosis*, was not the trouble. So far as it simply asserted that the elements are changed and become the very Body and Blood of Christ, it is good. That fact cannot be over emphasized. The thing to do was obvious. *Metousiosis* was an apt term though it does not belong to the Fathers. It had been used by authoritative writers, therefore the Greeks kept it. But the Russians safe-guarded themselves by avoiding "transubstantiation" and using a good Slavonic rendering of it. Thus, Khomiakoff writes that his Church "does not reject the word transubstantiation; but she does not assign to it that material meaning which is assigned to it by the teachers of the Churches that have fallen away."[2] Mesoloras, in expounding the significance of *Metousiosis*, brackets it with Transubstantiation and Dyovouniotos declares that the Western Church uses the latter term to expound "its theory of the mode of the change" but the Eastern Church "simply to state the fact of the change," and so on.[3]

Many of us would be prepared to subscribe the Tridentine definition of transubstantiation, but the Eastern-Orthodox desire no such subscription on our

[1] *Tserkovy Viestnik*, March 27th, 1897.

[2] *Russia and the English Church*, p. 207.

[3] Dyovouniotos, p. 101. The Roman Catholic, Dr. Fortescue, has failed to grasp the point of difference and quite wrongly endeavours to identify Papalist and Orthodox teaching on the Eucharist, e.g. *The Eastern-Orthodox Church*, pp. 384, seq.

part. They would probably be content with a declaration such as that which appears in the next chapter.

Turning from this long digression to the second clause of Professor Androutsos' third question, viz.: *And what is the character of the Unbloody Sacrifice*?[1] it should be noted that like the first clause it is prompted by his doubts concerning the language of our Thirty-nine Articles.

That what he asks us to affirm is very far from the vindication of those "sacrifices of masses" condemned in our Thirty-first Article, is evident from his seventh chapter, in which he expounds the Orthodox doctrine at length: "Since the Bread and Wine are really changed, as a fact, into the Body and Blood of Christ, and since Christ is the chief administrator of the Sacraments through the priest, the further fact follows that the Lord present in the Eucharist with His inseparable High priestly energy, offers Himself through the priest to God, or as Thalhofer expresses it: 'He lets free upon the Community and the priest who represents it, His Flesh and His Blood that They may be offered to the Divine Majesty' (*Katholik Liturgch* 293, 2) and so the faithful appropriate to themselves the benefits of His sufferings; and this is something almost incomprehensible to the common mind. Now this offering of Christ Jesus is made as a whole, not to reconcile God to Mankind, which was done once for all on the Cross, but that the individual may appropriate to himself the gift of the Cross and so apply to himself its redemptive energy. This is clearly the meaning of the words *renewal* and *repetition*, which both the Orthodox and the Western theologians frequently make use of, signifying the relation of this Sacrifice to that on Golgotha. This question does not deal with a *secondary or duplicatory repetition* so as to have two independent sacrifices instead of one; but it has regard to a real *Presence* and

[1] θυσία ἀναίμακτος, the customary term for the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

a *setting forth* of the one sacrifice which is offered in heaven continually, since the sacrifice on Golgotha and that of the Eucharist are one and the same, merely differing in the form of the sacrifice and its saving operations."[1]

To this he adds a note, "At the session of the Synod held at Vienna in 1874 by the Old Catholics, Döllinger unfolded the character of the Unbloody Sacrifice thus: 'The celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the Church is not a continual repetition or renewal of the propitiatory sacrifice which Christ once offered on the Cross, but the character of this latter sacrifice is exhibited in the former, for it is a continual commemoration of it and the setting forth and presenting on earth of that the first offering of Christ for the Salvation of redeemed humanity, which according to Hebrews xi. 11–12 is offered continually by Christ Who appears before the face of God for us.' When Döllinger observed that perhaps this exposition did not agree altogether with the doctrine of the Orthodox Church, Professor Zichos D. Rhossis said that 'This statement on the Eucharist does not seem counter to the doctrine of the Orthodox Church so long as the words 'setting forth and presentation' did not signify a sensible and visible setting forth, but was recognized as an inward union of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the heavenly sacrifice and as a real relation therewith.' This being admitted, the statement was accepted by all (including the Easterns) without any change." *Z. Rhossis*, 1874, p. 23.

If it be objected that in his own statement Professor Androutsos employed logic to arrive at fresh results, he would rightly answer that he could justify each stage of it by a quotation from the Fathers. After reading it, the majority of Anglicans would probably not hesitate to answer in the words of Dositheus that they hold the

[1] Androutsos, pp. 91, 92.

Eucharist to be a "true and propitiatory"[1] Sacrifice which is offered for all the faithful, both living and dead.[2]

The bearing of Professor Androutsos' fourth question on the *economic* recognition of Anglican Orders has been already explained. Most of those Anglicans unacquainted with Eastern Orthodox theology to whom I have submitted it have been repelled by a certain stiffness, absent in the Greek original, which appears in Dr. Groves Campbell's translation,[3] "*Will it* (sc. '*the High Church party*') *receive these* (sc. *the Œcumenical*) *Councils as infallible organs*[4] *of the true Church, the declaration of which bind* eo ipso *every particular Church and accept them always as the true faith?*"[5]

In the days when Pusey and J. M. Neale, then leading Anglo-Catholics, made it their chief task to teach their countrymen the general principles of Church authority, much was heard and written of the Œcumenical Councils. Other times other needs. It is perhaps inevitable, but it appears to be a great weakness of the Anglo-Catholic movement of to-day that Anglicans are left with comparatively little instruction on the subject and, on the whole, are hazy just as to what constituted the Œcumenical Councils, with what dogmatic and disciplinary paramouncy their decisions are invested, and why.

In consequence it is not surprising that when the average "High Churchman" is suddenly asked to designate them as "infallible organs of the true Church"

[1] *θυσίαν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἱλαστικήν.*

[2] G. Williams, p. 159. The Constantinople Delegation in July, 1920, asked for a statement of the kind and told us that they stressed it as a *desideratum* of the first importance.

[3] See p. 14.

[4] On the misleading impression given by those two words see below, p. 81.

[5] *περὶ οἰκουμενικῶν συνοδων, ἂν ἀποδέχεται αὐτὰς ὡς ὄργανα τῆς ἀληθοῦς Ἐκκλησίας ἀνεπισφαλῆ ὧν αἱ ἀποφάσεις δεσμεύουσιν* eo ipso *πᾶσαν ἐπὶ μέρους Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πάντα ἀληθῆ πιστόν.* Androutsos, Greek Original, p. 83. The last three words literally mean (bind) every true believer.

and especially when we remember some of the connotations of the word infallibility in Western controversy —he is inclined to refuse offhand. The picture which scares him is that of all the Bishops of Christendom convoked to form "an infallible organ" of the Church. They come together conscious that once they are in Council, the decrees which issue from them are a revelation from God. The Church, also conscious of the fact, waits and listens to accept whatever they may decree. To his mind, leaving scriptural, historical and traditional warranty out of the question, the claim of a given body of bishops to be infallible is as unjustifiable as the claim of a given bishop to be infallible. He can no more concede that the bishops who attended any one of the Œcumenical Councils on entering into formal session became *ipso facto* infallible than that the Pope becomes infallible by formally taking his seat on the throne of St. Peter.

Such an alarm is as needless as the picture is fantastic. Professor Androutsos would hardly dislike such a theory of the Œcumenical Councils less than the theory of Papal Infallibility which is its archetype. The impression given by Dr. Groves Campbell's translation—though it is just passable—is misleading. To begin with, the Greek for "*infallible*" in the question[1] is a word which has no exact equivalent in English and perhaps would find better renderings in "incontrovertible," "which cannot fail," or "which cannot be overthrown." It is not the technical Greek term for the infallibility of the Church[2] and is to be taken as applied to the instrument rather than the agent of infallibility.

Secondly, while the Eastern-Orthodox predicate infallibility of the Church, they do not predicate it of

[1] ἀνεπισφαλῆ.

[2] Greeks use the term τὸ ἀλάθητον τῆς ἐκκλησίας for the infallibility of the Church, τὸ ἀλάνθαστον (less often τὸ ἀλάθητον) for that of the Pope.

her hierarchy as "an organ" which can act apart from the whole body of the faithful. And thirdly, neither before nor during their session could any one of the Œcumenical Councils have been recognized as infallible, but only when and after its declarations had been recognized as true by the general consent of the whole Church.

There is nothing mechanical, indeed, about the Eastern-Orthodox theory of the Œcumenical Councils. It starts with the fact that Christ Himself, and not only Christ but also the Life-giving Holy Spirit dwells in the Church which received the Truth once and for all from Christ Himself, and being perpetually enlightened and vivified in that Truth by that Spirit is possessed of the characteristic of infallibility.[1]

The members of the Church may lose the Truth and fall from the Truth, but the whole Church cannot. She is sustained in it by the Spirit who guides her. His guidance is operative in His teaching. That teaching is not given directly, but is mediated through the ancient Fathers and the rulers of the Catholic Church. So mediated, it is known and recognized in the whole Catholic Church by His operation, *such recognition being necessarily integral to the process of its mediation.*

The Eastern-Orthodox, indeed, maintain a complete analogy between the mediation of the teaching of the Spirit in Holy Scripture and its mediation in the dogmatic utterances of the Church. As the Books of the inspired Bible writers are the Word of the Spirit and not theirs alone, so the Tradition of the Fathers and the declarations of the Œcumenical Councils are the Teaching of the Spirit. But as every writing of the former was not necessarily His Word, so every utterance of the latter was not necessarily His Teaching. In inspiring the Books of the Bible, He inspired the Church to receive them. In enabling the Fathers to

[1] Mesoloras, Symbolics, vol. ii, part 1, § 33, p. 17.

record the Tradition of the Faith He enabled the Church to receive and hold it. In enlightening the hierarchs of the Church to stabilize the Truth against error, He enlightens the faithful to discern His decree. His inspiration is not to be perceived alone in the voice of the men who are the immediate instruments of His manifestation of the Truth, but in the voice of the whole Church. It is by their declarations that the Church becomes conscious of His inspiration, but they themselves only realize that inspiration because it is operative to make the whole Church realize with them, and to make them realize with the whole Church, that those declarations bear the character of Divine Truth. Until the process is sealed by general consent, they themselves do not know their utterances to have been binding as on all the faithful. To the Orthodox, therefore, the Œcumenical Councils are to be distinguished from all other Synods as being special dispensations, each of which answered a particular need of the Church. Each of them stands by itself as an exceptional occasion on which, and an exceptional organ by which, the Church was guided by the Holy Spirit to free herself from the danger of error and to assert the Truth.

The Church has equipped herself with plentiful and precise machinery for the normal exercise of the teaching office and the jurisdiction of her hierarchy. The calling of Synods of all sorts and their procedure are regulated and fixed by canons and by precedents. Human fallibility is free to make or mar them. There is no method, however, by which an Œcumenical Council can take place except by the special operation of the Holy Spirit.[1]

[1] Just what the Eastern-Orthodox do not regard an Œcumenical Council to be may be seen from a Papalist definition, which in its silence as to the operation of the Holy Spirit, no less than in its rigid mechanism, may serve to illuminate what I have written above. Even if the anachronistic developments about the Papacy were omitted, the result would be the same. "The *Universal or Œcumenical Councils:* at which the

The Eastern-Orthodox would thus agree that members of the Great Council of Nicæa, of the Council of Constantinople, or of the Council of Chalcedon, were no more collectively invested with infallibility than the faithful laity[1] who received the Symbol which they decreed and promulgated, and that if those Anglicans who dispute the decrees of the Nicene Council of 789 be right, that they were never received by the whole Church, that Council is not Œcumenical. If they do not number the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) among the Œcumenical Councils, it is not because, as Papalist writers assume, they hesitate to reckon Œcumenical a council from which the Pope or his legates were absent, but because, even though the whole hierarchy of the Church[2] had been present or concurrent, the Holy Spirit has not led the whole Church to recognize His infallible guidance in its decrees.

Professor Androutsos therefore does not ask us to agree that there is any human agency which at its discretion can convoke an infallible Council. But he does ask us to believe that by the operation of the

bishops and other privileged persons from all the ecclesiastical provinces of the world are summoned to be present under the presidency of the Pope or his legates, and are bound to attend, unless in case of reasonable hindrance ; and whose decisions are then received by the whole Church and have the force of law for all the faithful. Hence it is clear that a Council may possibly be intended to be Œcumenical and be summoned as such, and yet not receive the rank of an Œcumenical Synod—as when its progress is stopped or when it becomes divided, and the like, and for such reasons does not receive the approval of the whole Church, and particularly of the Pope. So it was with the so-called *Latrocinium* or Robber Synod at Ephesus in A.D. 449." *History of the Church Councils*, Hefele, trans. by Clark, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894.

[1] "Among us neither Patriarchs nor Synods could at any time have brought in novelties. For the protection of Religion (*θρησκεία*) is the whole body of the Church, i.e., the People (ὁ λαός) which has kept on willing its expression of Religion (*θρήσκευμα*) to be unchanged and of the same kind as that of its Fathers." Encyclical of the Holy Catholic and Eastern Church to the Orthodox in Every Place, Constantinople, The Patriarchal Press, 1848. The translation is my own. This Encyclical, issued in answer to Pius IX, was signed by all four Eastern Patriarchs and 29 bishops. Khomiakoff described it to Palmer as "being the only instance for more than a hundred years of a declaration of Faith coming near to an Œcumenical act," Riley's *Birkbeck* p. 93, where his quotations from a Russian version are a paraphrase rather than a translation.

[2] Of course the Eastern-Orthodox regard the "whole Church" as having been limited to their own Communion since Rome led the West into Schism in 1054.

Holy Spirit Christ can cause His Church to speak "incontrovertibly"; and he points to the general consent of the whole Church as conclusive evidence that He had caused her to do so on the particular occasions, and by the particular instrumentality, of the Œcumenical Councils.[1]

That is to say beyond, of course, the possibility that in the Divine Wisdom a future Council of the whole Church may be used to guide the Church infallibly, he asks us to affirm nothing but that the particular Œcumenical Councils were—and, of course, remain—"infallible organs" of the Catholic Church and that their declarations as part of the Faith are binding on all Christians.[2]

The immediate reason for which he framed his question is given by him in his fifth chapter. He there repeats an interpretation of our 19th, 20th and 21st Articles of Religion, which most of us would regard as uncertain, and very many of us would repudiate as untenable, and writes "God's revealed Word is transmitted through the Church, pure and undefiled, by the continued abiding of the Holy Spirit, Whose vehicle is to be found according to the Orthodox Catholic Church in the whole body of the Episcopate which represents the Church as a whole. Now the Church of England lays down in her Thirty-nine Articles that the Bible is the final test and ultimate interpretation of Christian knowledge and she holds that the Œcumenical Councils have erred and are liable to err.[3] It is therefore

[1] "He that accepts a novelty reproaches with deficiency the preached Orthodox Faith, which has long ago been sealed as complete and admits of no diminution, increase, or change whatever. And he who dares to effect or advise or intend such a thing has already denied the Faith of Christ . . . through blaspheming against the *Holy Spirit as not having spoken fully in the Scriptures and through the Œcumenical Councils*," Encyclical of 1848, § 20, p. 42.

[2] "The only ground for Union on which the Churches can, of necessity, meet is the ground of the Seven Œcumenical Councils," Androutsos, p. 131.

[3] Of course the Articles do not say this of an Œcumenical Council, but only of a General Council, i.e. of such a Council as the Latrocinium or as Ferrara-Florence, which, though all the hierarchy was summoned, were repudiated, and therefore were not Œcumenical.

apparent, they (sc. the Papalists) urge, that by making such declarations her Episcopate is deprived of its essential supports, the true guardianship[1] as well as the true transmission of the deposit of the Faith and consequently the Divine nature of preaching in the English Church is assailed. . . . But this opinion does not seem correct or acceptable. No doubt some conviction should be expressed by the English Church that she holds the doctrine of the Lord pure and unadulterated and it is consequently necessary that she should accept the Orthodox doctrine that the infallible Church,[2] as represented by the whole body of the Episcopate, is the arbiter and guardian of Christian knowledge, and also hold that the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils, illuminated as they are by the light of the Spirit of God, are to be received as unquestionable and not open to any controversy by any one whatsoever. But there are some Anglicans who come fairly close to this true doctrine of the Church, etc."

I believe that not only would the "High Church (party)" readily give the assurance for which Professor Androutsos asks[3] but that there are very few Anglicans who would not be sympathetically attracted to the Orthodox Theory of the Church. It is true that when the infallibility or fallibility of the Church are placed in harsh contrast, Liberal Churchmen, to say nothing of Evangelicals, instinctively range themselves on the side of the latter. Their first postulate is freedom

[1] *τὴν ἀλάθητον φυλακὴν καὶ μετάδοσιν.*

[2] *ἀλάθητος Ἐκκλησία.*

[3] He would probably be satisfied by such a resolution as was passed synodically by both Houses of Convocation on June 16, 1871, that "there is one, true, Catholic and Apostolic Church, founded by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; that of this true Catholic and Apostolic Church the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her are living members; and that the Church of England desires to maintain firmly the Catholic faith as set forth by the Œcumenical Councils of the Universal Church, and to be united upon those principles of doctrine and discipline in the bonds of brotherly love with our Churches in Christendom." Copies of this resolution, done into Greek, were sent to the Patriarchs of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches; Joyce, *Acts of the Church*, Whitaker, London 1886.

from the dead hand in the adventures of Faith. Logical decisions, however, have nothing to do with Orthodoxy and in the final analysis pure intellectuality is not the only characteristic of Liberal Christianity.

It may well be that in the final analysis the resolvent of the antithesis, not only between Liberal Anglicanism and Orthodoxy, but between Anglican Liberals and Anglo-Catholics may be found in Khomiakoff's great saying: "Dans l'Eglise l'infaillibilité en fait de dogme, c'est à dire la connaissance de la vérité, s'appuyait sur la sainteté de l'amour mutuel des chrétiens en Jesus Christ."[1]

It is in the spirit of those words that he puts the case for the Œcumenical Councils thus, "Depuis sa fondation par les Apôtres l'Eglise était une. Cette unité qui embrasse tout le monde connu, qui unissait les îles Britanniques à l'Espagne, à l'Egypte et à la Syrie, n'avait jamais été troublée. Quand une hérésie s'élévait, le monde chrétien envoyait ses representants, ses hauts fonctionnaires, à ces augustes assembleés que nous nommons conciles, et qui, malgré tous les désordres et quelquefois même les violences qui en ont terni la pureté, offrent par leur caractère pacifique et par la hauteur des questions qu'elles avaient a résoudre, le plus noble des spectacles dans l'histoire des hommes. . . . L'Eglise toute entière acceptait ou rejetait les décisions de ces assembleés selon qu'elle les trouvaient conformes ou contraires à sa foi et à sa tradition et nommait Œcuménique ceux des conciles qu'elle reconnaissait pour être l'expression de sa pensée intime. Autorité temporaire dans les questions de discipline, ils devenaient témoignage irrécusable et immuable dans les questions de foi. Ils étaient la voix de l'Eglise. Les hérésies ne détruisaient pas cette divine unité. Elles étaient des erreurs personnelles et non des scissions provinciales ou

[1] *L'Eglise Latine et la Protestantisme*, Lausanne, Benda, 1872, p. 107.

diocésaines. Tel était l'ordre de la vie ecclésiastique dont le sens intime est depuis bien des siècles complétement inconnu dans tout l'Occident."[1]

The spirit of Orthodox theology is the spirit of mutual love and it is in that spirit that Professor Androutsos called us to answer his questions.

[1] Khomiakoff, *L'Eglise Latine et la Protestantisme*, p. 32.

CHAPTER IV

A PATH TOWARDS REUNION

IN the foregoing pages I have set out my reasons for believing that :—

1. Reunion and Intercommunion between the Anglican Churches and the Eastern-Orthodox are alike impossible without full dogmatic Union[1] and that at present the opening of formal negotiations to bring them about would not only be premature but disastrous.

2. The *economic* recognition of our Orders by the Eastern-Orthodox would greatly accelerate the existing *rapprochement* between the two Churches and would create a situation which would prepare the *terrain* for Reunion.

3. That such *economic* recognition would be secured, if a large body of Anglican Clergy gave satisfactory answers to the four questions put by Professor Androutsos which I have discussed in my preceding chapters.

With that end some of us[2] who had been in close contact with the Constantinople Delegation to the Lambeth Conference of last summer have drafted a letter which, if signed by some thousands of the Anglican Clergy and sent to the Œcumenical Patriarchate as the centre of the Eastern-Orthodox world and the

[1] The phrase is Professor Androutsos', not mine. It does not necessarily imply identity of presentment and language.

[2] sc. members of the Society of the Faith. Other theologians mentioned on p. 2 of my Preface approved its terms but are not responsible for its form.

focus of Eastern-Orthodoxy, is of a type, we believe, that would dispose Eastern-Orthodox theologians to decide that, not only the historico-canonicity of Anglican Orders but also their Purpose, are adequate, especially with Roman Catholics, for *economic* recognition. In its composition we have been studious, as far as possible, to use terms[1] which would be used by the Eastern-Orthodox and to avoid making it an Anglican party document.

This little book has been written with the object of urging the great benefit to the cause of Reunion which would result from a speedy declaration of the kind, and in the hope that those who have the power to make it will not let slip the present opportunity.

I am conscious, of course, that our own essay might well be improved. None the less I print it here to show what we have in mind. It runs :—

DRAFT OF SUGGESTED DOCTRINAL DECLARATION
to be addressed to
His Grace, the *Locum Tenens*
of the Œcumenical Patriarchate and the Holy Synod
of the Great Church of Constantinople.

We, being Priests of the Anglican Communion, earnestly desiring to develop an understanding with our brethren of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches, and rejoicing that in God's providence there are manifold evidences of the increasing growth of sympathy and mutual love between the two Communions, now write to your Grace and to the Holy Synod of Constantinople, in order to set forth plainly that which we hold to be the true doctrine of our Communion on certain matters of Faith, touching the which we gather from the

[1] With a view to an ultimate Greek translation we tried to use the English terms which have been employed to translate Professor Androutsos' book. Where a term employed by him did not occur to us, we have generally used one from the English version of the Constantinople letter or from Dositheus. The reader can supply these for himself from Appendix I.

utterances of Eastern-Orthodox hierarchs and theologians that the authorities of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches would have welcomed an explicit statement from the recent Lambeth Conference.[1]

1. We hold that the one saving Faith, in which it is the will of God that the Churches of Christ should be united in the bond of peace and of the Spirit, is the Faith of the Undivided Church of Christ, which Faith is set forth in the Holy Scriptures, has been preserved in the writings of the ancient Fathers and the Tradition of the Church, and has been safeguarded by the Œcumenical Councils through the operation of the Holy Spirit.
2. We believe that, in spite of many individual departures therefrom, that Faith has been forsaken neither by the Churches of Great Britain nor by their daughter Churches of the Anglican Communion.
3. We hold that each particular self-governing Church is rightly independent and self-administered[2] in matters which are not essential to the Faith, and which do not involve a falling away from any Catholic and general decree.
4. We hold that an Œcumenical Council is the supreme tribunal[3] of the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, and that the dogmatic decrees of the Councils which have been accepted as such by the whole Church are incontrovertible and binding on all Christians.
5. As touching any matters in which the Church of England may seem, in the judgment of the Authorities of the Eastern Church, to have departed

[1] The Eastern-Orthodox find it difficult to grasp the distinction between the Lambeth Conference and a Synod and between the resolutions of the former, which bind no one except its members, and Synodical acts.

[2] αὐτοκέφαλος καί αὐτοδιοικητός.

[3] ἀνώτατον κριτήριον.

from the dogmatic decrees of the Œcumenical Councils, we declare that, while we know of no such departure, we accept the Faith as expounded by those Councils.

6. We recognize that the only form of the Constantinopolitan Creed (popularly called the Nicene Creed), which has Œcumenical authority, is without the addition of *Filioque*, and desire that it may be added in its original form to the Book of Common Prayer and be so used on solemn occasions.
7. We accept the Seven Sacraments of Baptism, the Eucharist, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction, understanding by the word "Sacrament" a rite in which some special and appropriate grace is given from God to man, by means of an outward and visible sign, ordained either by Christ or by His Apostles acting on the authority which He gave them.
8. We affirm the essential necessity of the Sacrament of Orders, according to the commands of Christ, the intention of the Apostles, and the Tradition of the Church. This is secured in the Churches of the Anglican Communion by the transmission of the priesthood by the imposition of the hands of Bishops, to whom it has been transmitted in like manner by the imposition of hands in a succession from the days of the Apostles.

We, the undersigned, therefore hold that the Church, by the authority and power given to her by her Founder and Head, has conferred upon us and upon our brethren in the Ministry of the Anglican Communion the Sacrament of Orders, with the purpose that we should (*a*) preach and teach the Word of God; (*b*) offer the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed; (*c*) sacramentally absolve sinners who

repent and confess their sins; (*d*) otherwise minister to the flock of Christ according to the ancient Faith and practice of the Universal Church.

9. We hold that, at the moments of Consecration in the Eucharist, the Bread and the Wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true Body and the true Blood of Christ, and as such are to be given to and received by the Faithful. Also, we hold that Christ there present is to be adored. As to the actual manner of the change, and method of the Divine Presence, no doctrine on this point is laid down in any Œcumenical Council, and therefore, while believing the fact, we do not venture to define the method. There is here a Divine Mystery which passes human understanding, and our Church, while asserting that one particular explanation of the manner of the Divine Presence is not tenable, has attempted no definition on her own authority.

10. We hold that honour should be given to the Saints departed, and that, alike in our public and private prayers, we should ask them for the benefit of their intercession. We desire that, in this matter, our Liturgy and other services should be conformed to primitive patterns.

11. We account the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion as a document drawn up only for the internal order of our own Church, and so to be interpreted in accordance with the Faith of that Undivided Church of which we are but a part. We consider them to be of secondary importance, having primary reference only to local controversies of the Sixteenth Century, and therefore to be received as in no wise of equal authority with, but as altogether subordinate to, Holy Scripture, the Tradition of the Fathers and the declarations of the Œcumenical Councils of the Church.

It will be noted that the above declaration goes beyond giving categoric answers to Professor Androutsos' four questions. Some of us doubted the wisdom of this. There seemed, however, good reason for each extension. We have also avoided explications except where they seemed very desirable and have aimed at confining ourselves to simple statements.

Thus we felt that it would be impossible to commend the statement as to the Œcumenical Councils to Anglicans without a preliminary statement that the Faith of the Undivided Church is the only right basis of Reunion and as to the authority by which that Faith is to be tested and received.

It seemed also that it would be well to refer to the Œcumenical Creed, to give a concise statement as to our Ordinations, and to speak explicitly as to the secondary authority of the Thirty-nine Articles.

The statement as to Prayer for the Dead and the asking for the Intercession of the Saints was added because the Constantinople Delegation particularized their absence from our Liturgy as giving rise to doubt concerning our doctrine of Eucharistic Intercession.

Highly desirable though these subsidiary statements may be, it does not follow of necessity that they would be essential to the acceptability of the declaration.

In asking the reader's kindly consideration of our effort, it will be well to remind him just what the extent and limit of the effect of its success would be.

No matter how completely any declaration made by a section of the Anglican Communion might show its signatories to be at one in principle with the Eastern-Orthodox, it could not bring about a formal recognition by Synodical Authority of the validity of Anglican Orders,[1] for the Eastern-Orthodox Church cannot recognize

[1] It would be the same even if the whole Lambeth Conference signed such a declaration. Only full Union could warrant such a recognition.

the validity *per se* (i.e. *in principle*) of any Sacrament outside itself.

But if such a declaration as we have drafted were signed, for example, by those of the Anglican clergy who are members of the Anglican and Eastern Association, of the English Church Union, of the Anglo-Catholic Fellowship and kindred societies, and if it were accepted as satisfactory by the Holy Synod of Constantinople, it would, I believe, be followed by what I have termed the *economic* recognition of our Orders.

That recognition having been given, "solid foundations would be laid for a *rapprochement* and for a true Union"[1] between us and the Eastern-Orthodox. That is to say it would be evident that as to fundamental principles the dominant section in the Anglican Churches was in unanimity with the Eastern-Orthodox and relatively minor questions such as the *Filioque* could be discussed between them on a common basis of agreed principle, that of the Faith of the Undivided Church and of the Œcumenical Councils.

Moreover, which would be a much greater thing, although still disunited the two Communions could realize this mutual affinity in a measure which is impossible so long as the Eastern-Orthodox are doubtful as to our believing in the Ministry and as to whether we live by the same Sacramental System as they.

That doubt removed, the two Communions would continue to draw nearer to each other until, as difficulties disappeared one by one and the time ripened for Reunion, nothing would remain to be done except to complete the sacred labour by declaring it accomplished. The process of approximation would thus be marked by ever-growing mutual love and ever-increasing goodwill.

In particular it is not impossible that the occasions

[1] Androutsos, p. 114.

of what I have termed *Economic* Intercommunion might be greatly multiplied.

Not that Intercommunion in principle could be formally sanctioned in any way whatever. *Economic* recognition might be given to our Orders by the Eastern-Orthodox and the closest ties of intimacy might be created between us, but without full dogmatic Union. Intercommunion between the Church would no more be possible than eighty years ago when Muravieff told Palmer that, "To an individual the Church can concede nothing[1]; and no one can communicate except with an unconditional acceptance of all that she teaches and practises."[2]

It cannot be reiterated with too great emphasis that the Eastern-Orthodox Churches can in no wise whatever contemplate Intercommunion, a relation which in principle is the same thing as Reunion, with a Church or with individual members of a Church that is not in dogmatic agreement with them.[3]

As we have seen, however, there have been cases, notably in the British Dominions and U.S.A., of Eastern-Orthodox hierarchs, after weighing and balancing the matter in their wisdom, deciding that in the exercise of *Economy* they could permit their people to receive the Sacraments from the Anglican clergy; and this, in spite of the fact that, as a whole, Eastern-Orthodox theologians are waiting for further declarations on our part before deciding that the *economic* recognition of our Orders was outside the question.

That they held themselves able to give such permission was due, of course, to their not sharing those doubts owing to their first-hand acquaintance with us.

[1] Of course, as in principle and not by *Economy*.

[2] Newman, p. 394. For Philaret's definite refusal to consider Palmer's request for Communion see p. 414 of the above, as also *Philaret's Opinions and Extracts*, vol. v, p. 696.

[3] It would also be impossible for them to have Intercommunion with a Church itself in communion with a Church not in dogmatic Union with them.

Thus Chrysostom, Archbishop of Smyrna, wrote in 1910 that from the special studies which he had made he had formed the conviction that "the Orders of the Anglican clergy are good and valid."[1]

If the doubts of the body of Eastern-Orthodox theologians were finally removed, it is not impossible that such permission would be more and more frequently given.

It should, however, be noted carefully that, if given, it would not authorize the ordinary Anglican or the ordinary Eastern-Orthodox to receive the Sacraments from the other Communion but would only permit particular persons to do so in particular circumstances of emergency or isolation. In fact, though other Eastern-Orthodox theologians obviously take a different view[2] Professor Androutsos himself clearly holds at least that no formal sanction of such *praxeis* could be given. Thus, in his concluding chapter he writes, "One thing is certain, and that is that the path through which these persons in England toil for Union and seek to prepare the way for the desired work of Ecclesiastical Communion is not always that which is dogmatically or canonically permitted. As formerly the Bishops of Oxford and Edinburgh conceived the mutual receiving of the Eucharist at the hands of an English or Orthodox priest without dogmatic unity as a means of Ecclesiastical Union, so also English hierarchs[3] in the East ask now that, in the absence of an Orthodox priest, the Sacraments may be administered to the Orthodox by Anglican priests. But the Communion[4] of the Churches (reached) by this path would offend against the fundamental bases of Orthodoxy according to which, where there exists no unity in doctrine, there can exist no Ecclesiastical

[1] *Ἔγκυροι καὶ ἰσχυραί. Eirene*, 4, i, 22.
[2] See the letter quoted p. 7.
[3] This is hardly correct in 1921.
[4] *ἐπικοινωνία* a more formal term than *κοινωνία*. It might almost be rendered here by the Recovery of Communion.

Communion manifested in worship and in reception of the Sacrament.[1] The Orthodox Church can indeed pray for the heterodox and she does pray for them. But she cannot join in worship with them[2] and much less can she give permission to one of her members to receive the Sacramental Grace of the Holy Spirit, i.e. Baptism or the Eucharist, from a heterodox person. Between Orthodoxy and the heterodox is fixed a great gulf and it can only be bridged over by the bridge of dogmatic unity, and not simply by the mutual reception of the Sacraments that those who are so separated can be in Communion. The Divine Eucharist, the Sacrament by which the faithful, in being united with Christ, form one body, the *Sacramentum Unitatis* clearly cannot be given to the Orthodox by heterodox who are outside the Church.[3]

Uncompromising though at first reading these sentences appear, if studied carefully in the light of the passages I have quoted on *Economy* in my third chapter, they exclude, not the possibility of *economic* Communion in particular cases and under particular circumstances, but the formal sanction *in principle* of what may be called *emergency* Communion, the same exclusion, of course, applying to the formal sanction in principle of *emergency* Baptism and so forth.

I have no means of judging whether Professor Androutsos himself had such a reservation in mind. His language is certainly not inconsistent with that possibility. Moreover, the otherwise sweeping nature of his statement would be altogether contradicted by the repeated instances of the joining of Orthodox hierarchs

[1] εὐχαῖς καὶ μεταλήψει.

[2] συμπροσεύχεται

[3] Androutsos' Greek Original, pp. 93, 94. My own translation. Dr. Groves Campbell's, pp. 129, 130, is stiffer than the original, perhaps owing to his having a proselyte's vision of the Communion he has left, he being one of the few who have exchanged Anglicanism for Eastern-Orthodoxy. We may note that nowadays proselytization is mutually forbidden by the Anglican and the Eastern-Orthodox authorities.

in public worship with Anglicans and would place him in isolation.[1] Further, it is quite clear that those Eastern-Orthodox hierarchs who have bidden their people in America and the British Dominions to seek the Sacraments in emergency from Anglican priests must take the view that *economic* Intercommunion is permissible. But it is of only relative importance whether Professor Androutsos is to be interpreted as wholly excluding *economic* Intercommunion or only such Intercommunion as the permission of which in principle would be tantamount to admitting the theoretical validity of Sacraments outside the Eastern-Orthodox Churches and would be contrary to the fact that no general authorization of *economic* Intercommunion could be given or even considered by the Eastern-Orthodox Church.

The last thing, however, which phil-Orthodox Anglicans should or can desire is that our Eastern-Orthodox brethren should take any action whatever which would be inconsistent with their principles. We recognize and admire above all things the immutable constancy with which, though for a great part of the Communion its price has been intense and long-drawn suffering, terrible persecution, and the deprivation of the spiritual and material treasures of life, and though it has entailed great disabilities on the whole, the Eastern-Orthodox World has never flinched in its refusal, at the threat of force or at the more subtle temptation of compromise, to abandon a jot or tittle of its funda-

[1] Since this book was written the Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem has added a notable precedent by attending an Anglican service held in St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem, as a Thanksgiving for the assumption by the British of the mandate over Palestine, and by singing the Gospel thereat in his full vestments. Any one who knows the importance the Eastern-Orthodox attach to the recitation of the Gospel in public prayer, will realize how inconsistent with the non-permissibility of an *economic* sharing in our public worship by them such an act must be. *Guardian*, December 31st, 1920. Further, since this note was written, the Locum Tenens of Constantinople joined with the Archbishop of Canterbury in prayer in Lambeth Chapel on the occasion of his solemnly investing him with a Stavropegiac Enkolpion; itself a symbolic act.

mental. But we know also that the Eastern-Orthodox Church is characterized by no harsh and crabbed system of legalism and that it adjusts its decisions in the spirit of the goodwill and charity which are the first principles of its life.

We should, therefore, desire the Eastern-Orthodox to make no opportunist concession and to adopt no course which they cannot adopt freely *ex animo* and consistently.

On our side, while the recent Lambeth Conference discountenanced the idea of Intercommunion without formal Union[1] and while Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures[2] may be taken as showing it to be altogether contrary to the principles of historic Anglicanism, *economic* Intercommunion can and would almost certainly be permitted by our bishops. Thus the Lambeth Conference of 1908 recommended it (Resolution 62) specifically in the case of the Eastern-Orthodox[3] and provisionally in that of the East Syrians, etc. (64). A sub-Committee of the recent Lambeth Conference advised it under certain circumstances, and two of our bishops, apparently in interpretation of its 24th Resolution, which admitted Swedes to communicate at our altars, received Communion in a Swedish Church this year.[4]

[1] Resolution 12, B, "Believing, however, that certain lines of action might imperil the attainment of its ideal (sc. of Reunion) and the unity of its own Communion, the Conference declares that it cannot approve of general schemes of Intercommunion or exchange of pulpits." Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, S.P.C.K., 1920. It should be noted by Eastern-Orthodox who may read this that the Lambeth Conferences are not Synods but simply assemblies of bishops. Their statements, therefore, have no Synodical Authority and are couched as resolutions and not as enactments.

[2] See above, p. 35.

[3] "The Conference is of opinion that it should be the recognized practice of the Churches of our Communion (1) at all times to baptize the children of members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion in cases of emergency, provided that there is a clear understanding that Baptism should not be again administered to those so baptized. (2) At all times to admit members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion to communicate in our Churches when they are deprived of the ministrations of a priest of their own Communion." Report, p. 61.

[4] Bishops Henson of Durham and Woods of Peterborough, at Upsala, see *Guardian*, October 8th, 1920.

On the other hand, if Professor Androutsos intended to rule it out and if the body of Eastern-Orthodox theologians on consideration support his judgment, we should accept their *non possumus* without any bitterness of disappointment and should in no way relax our efforts to further the *rapprochement* between the two Communions.

At most, such *economic* Intercommunion would be but one among the many ties by which they are already knit together and which, if the question of our Orders were solved satisfactorily, would come into being in even greater number.

The creating and strengthening of those ties is our first duty, and the essential for the work of our Reunion with the Eastern-Orthodox.

If, when Rome effected its schism from the East in 1054, it carried us with it, we have long since seen that the Papal claims which were the motive of that schism were not substantial but an innovation destructive of the Unity of the Church.[1] Since we formally repudiated those claims, we have had no controversy with the Eastern-Orthodox but have had much experience of their practical life of Faith and love. None the less they and we have been, as it were, in worlds that are separated and have little lien with each other. We study their history, their theology, their customs, and they ours, but it is only now and again that we are able to catch each other's spirit. The will, the desire to unity is there. The thing which is needed to effect it is the close and intimate personal association of the individual members of the two Communions.

The clearing away of Eastern-Orthodox difficulties as to our Orders would do much to bring about such association, for, although certain great and fundamental

[1] The Eastern-Orthodox view may be read in Appendix I. So Headlam, p. 220, "The claim of the Papacy is that it promoted Unity. The verdict of History is that it has been the most frequent cause of disunion."

questions would remain to be settled, we should then know that our mystic life and theirs is formed by and expressed in the same covenanted symbols and means of Grace, and that the two Communions are of *pari materia*.

In order to resolve those doubts it is clear that we Anglicans should not allow ourselves to be restrained by any false pride, but that it should be our glory, as it is our duty, willingly, ungrudgingly, and of our own motion, to take every step and to make every concession which we can take and which we can make without being false to our own true principles, and that unasked and without expecting any return.

Ferrara-Florence pacts in religion are more pestilent even than the treaties of diplomatists and that besetting sin of Western Christianity the bazarlik of *do ut des* in matters spiritual is a horrible blasphemy against the soul of the Church.

While we should give freely all that we can give and should keep nothing back, we should neither look for return nor be willing to take anything that cannot be given freely; for our shame and humiliation can only be to have stiffened our necks in refusing to submit to that to which our conscience permits us to submit, but which our pride warns us may be used to our reproach.[1]

Moreover, the ground on which Anglo-Catholics stand is far too firm to need to be disguised with ecclesiastical camouflage. They are not *parvenus*. They have no doubt as to their Orders, the historical position of the Anglican Churches, or their unbroken Apostolic succession in Faith, authority and practice. They are conscious of no need to stand hat in hand to any one. They know themselves as the sons of fathers who had

[1] It is easy to understand, e.g. that English Nonconformists may not be able conscientiously to repudiate their orders by accepting episcopal ordination. It is impossible, on Christian principles, to understand how they could consider such ordination a humiliation.

the courage to answer the great call of the Spirit, to break free from the man-made system and innovations which strangled the life and checked the progress of the Western Church in the Middle Ages, and, in the chaos which followed that great accomplishment, never to be drawn aside from their determination to press on to the new work of the new world in the power of the unchanging and unchangeable faith given once and for all to the Saints.

If pride were ever defensible in such matters, they have no cause to bow their heads when they think of that goodly heritage.

They recognize, however, and recognize full well, that they have cause not to rest content in self-complacency with their inheritance. They know the treasures which their fathers shared with the rest of the West but let slip in the conflict, and are set to recover them. They know also that, like men born blind, who are aware that there is a faculty of sight but cannot define it because they have not experienced it, their fathers instinctively groped to find a living principle of brotherly unity, but could not tell what it was which they missed and for which they searched. They discover that principle in the Œcumenicity of Eastern Christendom, for the lack of which, in their own Communion and indeed in the whole West for the past thousand years, unity has been destroyed on the one hand by a war of differing doctrine, and on the other the unbrotherhood of self-assertive coercive rationalism has usurped the place of that humility and mutual love which are taught by the Spirit of God to think freely, and yet for unity's sake to dread nothing more than the breaking the ties of the common Faith. And they are eager to acquire that principle in the only way in which such gifts can be acquired, by close and intimate association with those among whom it is an inherited, traditional and living power.

Beside these needs of their own, there is nothing which fires them with such eagerness as the vision of the world as it might be were all Churches united in the bonds of the Spirit in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, nothing which fills them with such Divine discontent as the impotence of the Kingdom of Christ through the sinful disunion of Christendom.

There is no pilgrimage which they would not make to reach the trysting place of Reunion with their Western and Eastern brethren and no garb of abasement in which they would not clothe themselves to make it, saving only that in doing so they cannot be false to the Faith as they know it.

At present it is true that there is a barrier on the one straight path of principle in which they and their brethren of the Roman obedience could otherwise meet. The Anglo-Catholic priest who visits Roman Catholic countries cannot but feel himself at home with the worship and ways of the people. He is invigorated by their contagious devotion, is inspired by their zeal, and is strengthened by their Faith. They possess the treasures of the Altar, of the Tabernacle and of the friendship of the Saints which he longs to acquire for himself and his people. The simple, natural atmosphere is congenial to him. But they cannot come to meet him nor he go to meet them, however much he wills, until the half secular and wholly political edifice which has been built upon the primitive primacy of Rome be removed from the way and the Papacy be again the centre of unity which it was in the days of St. Leo and St. Gregory.

But as far as the Anglo-Catholic is concerned no serious obstacle bars his approach to the Eastern-Orthodox. Whatever they may be bound to say of us, there is no grave matter on which we have to challenge them. For example, it is not only that we admire their wonderful freedom from the schism, definition and heresy

which are the disease of the West or are grateful to them for their preservation, and their witness to, the primitive Faith and order of Christendom. We perceive that such virtues as those, and as their evangelical zeal, their mystic quality or their simple and natural devotion, are the fruit of that spirit of brotherhood which is their social inheritance. We desire to acquire that spirit by close association with them, and we believe that not only are they eager to impart it, but that in doing so they look forward to receiving in return some gift from us who have faced the problems of the modern world.

But be that as it may, alike for the cause of Reunion in general and in particular for Union with the Eastern-Orthodox, there is no lawful sacrifice which we would not make, nor is there any demand which, as I think, they can make that in the last resort we could not satisfy—except that we could not and would not separate from our English brethren who have not recovered the primitive Faith in its fulness and simplicity.

To take what is the most fundamental of intellectual differences, there is, indeed, a body of opinion in the English Church which, if the fallibility and infallibility of the Church must be placed in antithesis, would contend for the former.[1] I imagine indeed that some of our extreme Liberals would appropriate gleefully Khomiakoff's sarcastic description of the State Church of Prussia as "a society of good men differing in all their opinions, but earnestly seeking for Truth with a total certainty that it has not been found and with no hope at all ever to find it."[2]

Again, there is hardly a statement in the declaration given above in this chapter to which some Anglicans would not give a contradiction or refuse assent.

We understand our Eastern-Orthodox brethren's

[1] "No such thing as a strict and real infallibility exists here below." *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*, Sanday and Williams, Longman's, 1916, p. 106.

[2] Birkbeck, p. 40.

amazement at such a state of things, and we cannot be surprised that they should tell us that it is impossible for them to unite with a Church which contains such heterodox elements and admits of such disunity. In their place we should probably give an even less favourable verdict than they.

But with all their genius of charity they do not understand us here. Happily for them and thanks to the faithfulness of their ancestors, their Church rejected Papal innovations at the outset. They have suffered much from that bitter and inexorable secular policy of the Vatican which has made their subjugation or destruction its first political aim for a thousand years.[1] But they have not experienced the tragedy of the English Church which was carried unknowingly away into the Papalist error. Can they find no excuse for the individual Anglican who, when at last the English Church began to find its way back to the Faith and Practice of the Undivided Church, blundered, and in denying the Papal claim to be the sole mediator of the Divine authority, failed to see the right doctrine which had been obscured so long? Or who in rebelling against those Mediæval and Protestant innovations which destroyed the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the Ministerial System of the Apostolic Church, did not recover the Tradition of the Fathers?

If they cannot, we who are bound to them by the closest of all ties can.

We altogether repel Professor Androutsos' description of the English Church as "a sort of patchwork thing and a calculated affair constructed to admit all possible interpretations of the Creeds, the thought of which produces surfeit and disillusion."

We know that our Church is nothing of the kind. It is a Church which was carried away into error without

[1] See C. Diehl's *Byzance*.

its knowledge, which has never lost and has truly found its soul, which has been and is making its way back to the pure life and Faith of the primitive Church, which in the search for that good road has groped and sometimes has been near to stumbling, but which by the guidance of the Holy Spirit who dwells in her, has never wandered from the path of the Truth as it stands unchangeably revealed in the pages of Holy Scripture, as it is to be found in the Tradition of the Fathers and as it has been confirmed in the decrees of the Holy Œcumenical Councils.

It is true that in the English Church there exist such divergent schools—*not* Churches, as Professor Androutsos puts it—"as the High Church or Ritualistic party, the Low Church or Calvinistic party and the Broad Church party, as well as a scholarly party which has arisen from the study of the Bible and includes such men as Bright, Church, etc."[1] (we might add the Liberal, the Modernist, the Erastian and many other parties, and especially the Central as typified by Dr. Headlam and Archbishop Davidson) and, "All these communicate with one another."

It is our glory as we know it, and not our shame, that Anglo-Catholics communicate with them, for they are our brethren. We are bound to them by the most intimate spiritual ties. We have had life-long experience of their love, their devotion, their altruism and their zeal for Christ and for that Kingdom of His which they fight side by side and heart to heart with us in a heathen world to extend and to defend. We know that they are no heresiarchs and that, if they err in matters of the Faith, they are no conscious or wilful heretics. We can no more divorce ourselves from them than we can annul the Divine seal which binds together man and wife. If we had the power, we would no

[1] Androutsos, p. 105.

more shut them out from our Communion than we would part from Christ and His Saints.[1] We are content that our formularies, by their occasional ambiguity, do not force them to exclude themselves from it. If, indeed, the English Church were to be carried away by them and were to perpetrate a plain apostasy from the Faith as we are learning and have learnt to know it, the business would be ended and nothing would remain for us except, in forsaking her, to follow the plain guidance of the Holy Spirit and to gather ourselves together into a Church which stated its principles so clearly that no one who could not affirm them with a clear voice, could desire membership in it. But we believe that a disaster such as that can never happen, and that God's Holy Spirit is guiding not only the members of the Anglican Church but the whole body of English Christianity along that road the end of which is Reunion with all Christians in the bond of the Divine Revelation.

Meanwhile we can no more part with our heterodox brethren than an army of comrades on the march can cast away its members that are sick and wounded, or than St. Augustine could refuse fellowship with the Donatists.

We are convinced that the Holy Spirit is working to-day among us and that as the angry sea of intellectual controversy dies down, our heterodox Anglican brethren will assuredly find with us a common ground of agreement on which we and they and our Orthodox brethren may meet with the Saints in the unity of the Faith of the Fathers of the Undivided Church and in the bond of the Spirit.

We trust that the Eastern-Orthodox will approve our decision but, until God teaches us that the means we think to be His are not His Will, we Anglo-Catholics

[1] There is an individual duty to exercise *Economy* in such a state of affairs as prevails in the Anglican Churches.

must continue to hold by our English brethren while none the less we seek every occasion of drawing nearer to themselves.

In this we see no inconsistency or faltering in the Faith we have regained but rather the working of that Spirit of brotherly Love of which the Church is the organism no less than of Faith.

The lesson of the ages is that in the Cause of Reunion Christians need a stout and humble heart, a sure courage, an unbreakable patience, a large hope and a long view.

Finally, I would add some wise words with which Professor Comnenos, a member of the Constantinople Delegation to the 1920 Lambeth Conference, commented in *Anagennesis*, a periodical edited by himself, on September 15th, 1920:[1]

"To however great an extent our public continues very justly to be occupied chiefly with the political and military situation of our country, it is certain that the question of union with the Church of England is a matter of great concern and interest to it.

"The reasons for such interest are undoubtedly among many purely religious. Orthodox Christians who are sincerely and deeply religious cannot but be deeply grieved at the cleavage in the Christian Church, through the separation of Christians into many different groups, which are often even hostile to each other.

"But there is also another reason which more urgently disposes people of our race, our Orthodox Church, to turn eager eyes towards the Church of England and those who profess its Faith.

"This reason is the exceptionally friendly attitude of that Church towards ours, and the exceptional good

[1] This translation by Dr. Buchanan appeared in the *Church Times*, December 3rd, 1920.

feeling of the chivalrous English nation towards Greeks in general.

"This feeling cannot but find an echo in our sensitive and grateful spirit, and dispose us towards everything English, and cannot but strengthen and increase our desire for religious and ecclesiastical union with them.

"But moments do not destroy what ages have created, and the chasms produced by time equally require time (despite the utmost goodwill and, so to speak, superhuman efforts) to fill them up.

"Even if these chasms were bridged over, in a way, by the urgent needs of the times, the bridge would not be safe, and the bond of union would be weak and dangerous.

"Therefore our public and the faithful of our Church will understand that they must not be disappointed if the Patriarchal delegation sent forth with many longings and prayers, has not returned bringing union itself, or even any sure and safe arrangements for the near approach of that happy day.

"But the frank exposition of what it has done shows that it has not spent its time or the public money in vain, but that it has produced certain practical results.

"The most important of these practical results is the strengthening of the bonds of friendship and mutual knowledge which previous delegations to England and visits of distinguished bishops of our nation have produced.

"The importance of such friendship and mutual knowledge (which extends to the whole nation and Church) any one will easily understand, as he will also easily understand that only through such feelings can union be prepared for and brought to a successful issue.

"Another important practical result of the Patriarchal delegation to England is the fuller knowledge of their religious and ecclesiastical position by us, and of ours by them.

"Personal conversation, information gained by word of mouth, face to face, sight and intercourse, however disconnected and unsystematic they may be, fill many voids, and infuse real life into the impression of persons and things got from written words.

"Both they and we, under the impulse derived from this fuller and more living image, and rendered zealous by the fire of a sincere and friendly spirit, will consider calmly how each may respond better to the religious and ecclesiastical life of the other in such a way that the longed-for union may be established in strength, and without transgression against any religious conscience, in a manner better conforming to the historical traditions of each of us, and to whatever other necessary questions may be involved.

"The *Anagennesis*, which heralded the Patriarchal deputation with burning desires and hopes, has seen its return with joy, and cherishes the steady expectation that the Œcumenical Patriarchate will not permit what has been done to pass away and be forgotten, but, along with its other anxieties and cares, will follow up what has been accomplished, and will forward it by fitting efforts, strengthening and bringing towards its final issue one of the greatest, most useful and most Christian of works."

APPENDIX I

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE PRIESTHOOD AS SET FORTH IN SOME MODERN EASTERN-ORTHODOX DOCUMENTS

I. The Church: Its Composition and Infallibility, its Faith and the Authority thereof.

II. The Nature and Number of the Sacraments.

III. Holy Chrism or Confirmation.

IV. The Eucharist: The Real Presence and Sacrifice.

V. Confession and Absolution.

VI. Holy Orders.

VII. The Dead and the Saints.

VIII. The Sacrament of Unction: Euchelaion.

IX. Heterodox Sacraments.

APPENDIX I

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE PRIESTHOOD AS SET FORTH IN SOME MODERN EASTERN-ORTHODOX DOCUMENTS OF AUTHORITY

THE Eastern-Orthodox hold that the whole Faith is to be found in the Holy Scriptures which as God's Word are its primary, principal and unique source and standard.

No individual, however, can decide the Faith for himself by study from the Holy Scriptures. It is a principle of life and as such has been handed down in the Church and communicated from generation to generation by the operation of the Holy Spirit. It is indeed preserved in the writings of those primitive teachers who by general consent have been termed the Fathers of the Church, and certain chief parts of it have been stated dogmatically by Councils which have been recognized by general consent as authoritative and especially by those Councils the dogmatic decisions of which have been acknowledged as her voice by the whole Church. The Eastern-Orthodox therefore regard the whole body of the Tradition of the Fathers and the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils as a secondary but altogether reliable, necessary and mutually consistent source and standard for the study of the Faith. The individual, however, can no more derive the Faith for himself from the study of the Fathers and the dogmas of the Councils than he can from Holy Scripture.

Just as it is not sufficient that a man should deduce

the Faith for himself from Holy Scripture, so it is insufficient that he should deduce it for himself from the writings and doctrine of the ancient Fathers. It is by the living Tradition of the Church, by its corporate, social inheritance of to-day that the Faith is to be known. The Apostolic Succession of Faith is as essential as the Apostolic Succession of Orders.

The Eastern-Orthodox, therefore, are bound to maintain that the Faith as they hold it in their Tradition is identically the same, without alteration, addition or diminution, as the Faith of the Apostles and the Fathers.

That is a point of view hardly appreciated by English theologians, who are apt in consequence to expect the Eastern-Orthodox to agree to propositions which, though logically defensible as deductions from the writings of the Fathers, are incompatible with Orthodox Tradition.

To deal with the questions to which the Eastern-Orthodox must seek a satisfactory answer before according *economic* recognition to our Orders, it is, of course, necessary to understand their own teaching on the points raised.

Those points relate to the doctrine of the Priesthood, especially as to its existence for the Guardianship of the Faith and the Ministry of the Sacraments, and include (1) the Nature of the Church; (2) the authority of the Œcumenical Councils; (3) the Sacramental System; (4) the Real Presence; (5) the Sacrificial character of the Eucharist; and (6) Absolution.

I have therefore collected from the Orthodox Symbolic books the chief passages dealing with these matters, and have added a few dealing with Holy Chrism, Prayer for the Dead, the Intercession of Saints, the Unction of the Sick, and Heterodox Sacraments. These last are, perhaps, not strictly requisite for my purpose, but since the Constantinople Delegation of

1920 informed us that without explicit prayer for the Dead and explicit request for the prayers of the Saints, they could not accept our Liturgy,[1] they will be of value in reference to *economical* Intercommunion and it seemed well also to include a few passages on Chrism and Unction in order to clarify the Eastern-Orthodox doctrine of the Sacraments.

To the passages from the Symbolic Books I have added others from typical, authoritative catechisms now in use in the Russian and Greek Churches and from certain important encyclicals. These, of course, might have been multiplied but will be sufficient.

Where one exists, I have used an English translation for the convenience of the reader, and have placed the Greek of important words in a footnote.

By a Symbolic Book is meant a book the use of which for the exposition of the Faith throughout the whole Communion has been authorized by the heads of all the Orthodox Churches individually or synodically, or at least has been so received without challenge for a long period. While the statements of such a book are not comparable to the writings of the Fathers, a document of the kind necessarily has very great authority, for it is to be received (1) as an accurate setting forth and a witness to Orthodox belief and practice in the days of the writer; (2) as containing no departure from Orthodoxy; (3) as being Œcumenical in the sense that it is recognized and approved by the whole Church[2] for its general spirit and tenor, though of course not necessarily for its detailed personal opinions.

The five books received as Symbolic throughout all the Eastern-Orthodox Churches (i) *The Confession of Gennadius*, Œcumenical Patriarch 1454–1456, a short

[1] "Into all the services, in general, prayers must be inserted addressed to the Blessed Mother of God, to Angels and Saints, with the glorification and invocation of them (direct), also prayers for the dead (especially in the Liturgy and Burial Service)."—Observations of the Russian Holy Synod in the American C. P. B., Barnes & Frere, 1904.

[2] Michalescu, p. 129.

Statement of the Faith said to have been drawn up for Mahommed II and, as intended for Moslem reading, having nothing in it to concern us here.

(ii) *The Three Answers of Jeremiah II*, Œcumenical Patriarch (with three years' retirement) 1572–1595, addressed to the Lutherans of Wurtemburg and Tübingen in reply to their suggested Terms of Reunion.

The Synod of Jerusalem, which is held in the highest veneration and has almost an Œcumenical authority among the Eastern-Orthodox, declared in 1672 that these Answers were in full conformity with Orthodoxy.[1]

The translations are my own. The edition used is Mesoloras, Athens, 1863.

(iii) *The Confession of Metrophanes Kritopoulos*, Patriarch of Alexandria 1630 to 1640,[2] a vigorous polemic against both Papalism and Protestantism, written in 1625. Although it has received no synodical approval, it has been reckoned generally to be of the greatest authority and is therefore placed among the Symbolic Books. The translations are my own and are made from Mesoloras, Athens, 1883.

(iv) *The Catechism of Peter Mogila*, Metropolitan of Kiev 1632–1645, compiled (apparently in Greek with a Latin translation) under his direction in 1640, examined by the Synod of Jassy, approved by the four Patriarchs in 1643, promulgated by the Synod of Jerusalem,[3] consists of a complete exposition of the Faith in the form of question and answer, is directed first against Jesuit proselytization and secondly against German Protestantism.

The quotations are from *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Church*, translated by Lodvel,

[1] It need not be said here that the Eastern-Orthodox would not require the acceptance of the five books, described below, by a Western Church.

[2] Cyril Lucar, when Patriarch of Alexandria, took great interest in him and made him his Protosyncellos, sent him to England with the Codex Alexandremus and afterwards promoted him at Constantinople.

[3] Michalescu, p. 130.

1772, edited by Overbeck and Robertson, Baker, 1898. The Greek is taken from Mesoloras as above.

(v) *The Confession of Dositheus*, Patriarch of Jerusalem 1669–1707, drawn up against Calvinism and Papalism and appended to the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem with which it was promulgated. This Confession is most widely circulated in Orthodox countries and was formerly sent to the Nonjurors as an official and sufficient exposition of the Orthodox Faith by a Synod held at Constantinople in 1723 under the Œcumenical Patriarch Jeremiah III and the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem.

The quotations are from the translation in G. Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, Rivingtons, 1868. The Greek footnotes are from Kimmel's *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis*.

Other documents quoted are:—

(i) *The Synodical Declarations and the Patriarchs' Answers* given by G. Williams in the *Orthodox and Nonjurors* have necessarily the greatest relevance to our subject.

(ii) *The Encyclicals of the Œcumenical Patriarch Gregory VI*, 1835–1840, against (1) the Heterodox; (2) Latin Innovations; (3) the Lutherans and other Protestants, contain many passages bearing on the doctrine of the Church. They are not published in English but may be read in the series of Constantinople Encyclicals collected by M. Gedeon.[1]

(iii) *The Encyclical to the Orthodox in all places*, issued in rejoinder to Pius IX, January 1848, by the Œcumenical Patriarch Anthimos and the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem is held to be of high authority. The quotations are from the American translation, Papers of the Russo-Greek Committee's, Second Series, No. 1, New York, Trowe, 1867, and the Greek footnotes from the first edition at the Patriarchal Press, 1848.

[1] See p. 193.

(iv) *The Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople* to Leo XIII was issued in 1895 by the Œcumenical Patriarch Arthimus and twelve bishops, and is very valuable for our purpose. The English and Greek are both taken from the reprint with a most admirable translation of the Archimandrite Metallinos published by the Orthodox Greek Community of Manchester, 1896.

(v) *The Russian Holy Synod's Epistle* of 1903 to the Œcumenical Patriarch contains much in the principle of œcumenicity. The quotations are from Birkbeck's translation, S.P.C.K. 1904.

(vi) *The Catechism of Nic laos Bul aris*, a famous authoritative Seventeenth Century theologian, published in 1681. The translations are my own from the Constantinople edition of 1861.

(vii) *Russian Catechism* compiled in 1718 by Archbishop Resenski, by order of Peter the Great, superseded especially by Philaret's Catechism.

The passages are from the translation by J. T. Philipps, 1723, London.

(viii) *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church*, drawn up in 1823 for use in Russia by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, 1821–1867, and after much controversy revised and approved by the Holy Synod, is marked by the elimination of phrases and expressions formerly borrowed by Russian theologians from Latin sources.

The quotations are from the Doctrine of the Eastern Church, Blackmore, Brown & Co,, 1845.

(ix) *A Sacred Catechism* by M. Bernardakis, chosen and approved by the Œcumenical Patriarchate in 1874 for use in the schools of its jurisdiction.

The translation used is by Cobham, Government Press, Cyprus, 1903.

(x) *The Catechism of the Orthodox Church*, by Ignatios Moschake, authorised by the Holy Synod of Greece, published 1888. The translation used is by Baker, S.P.C.K. 1912.

I. THE CHURCH:

ITS COMPOSITION AND INFALLIBILITY, ITS FAITH AND THE AUTHORITY THEREOF.

"I hold that the Holy Church can in no wise be led astray in regard to sacred dogmas when she considers them in common action and in Synod. For two or three or more considering them by themselves, it is admitted, may err. But that the whole Church in common action should err is altogether impossible . . . Wherefore it necessarily follows that the Church of God is inerrant[1] and that we should obey her and her decision."[2] —John Palaeologus at Florence, *Sgyropoulos*, Sect. ix, Cap. x, Creyghton, p. 265.

"The Church of Christ, as St. Paul says, is the pillar and ground of the Truth, against the pledge given to which by the Lord the gates of hell cannot prevail. If any bring in things strange, she none the less abides safe and unimpaired, inasmuch as she is founded on a rock, even on those fundamentals on which the Truth is founded. For the totality of the Church of Christ[3] is of the Truth, and those who are not of the Truth are not of the Church of Christ."—*Jeremiah Answer* I, p. 120.

"We cannot, relying on our own exegesis, consider or expound or interpret the meaning of the words of inspired Scripture other than according to the theologians approved for their pious purview by the Holy Synods in the Holy Spirit. . . . But what, some one may say, shall be the corrective? God directing this; neither to touch nor to think of anything other than those things which have been decreed by the Holy Apostles and the Holy Synods. For he who keeps this principle

[1] ἀπλανῆ. [2] ἀποφάσει. [3] οἱ τῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας ὅλοι τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσί

of conduct strictly shall be our comrade and in Communion with us and our fellow believer. But how can he who contemns the canons we have mentioned . . . have Communion with us? . . . And further, when any one overthrows anything which has been decreed by the inspired fathers,[1] it is not to be reckoned an exercise of *economy*[2] but a trespass and a betrayal of dogma. And further, he who keeps the judgment of Christ before his eyes, must know how great is the danger of those who diminish or add to those things which have been transmitted by the Spirit and must avoid priding himself on making innovations and must rest content with those things which have been proclaimed by the Saints. Wherefore our theologians one and all forbid us to think otherwise than that there is one corrective, viz. to range oneself with *the Holy Synods and to follow the Canons of the Apostles.* . . . Wherefore, O Germans . . . who wish whole-heartedly to approach our most Holy Church, we shall gladly receive your love . . . if in agreement with us you be willing to follow these apostolic and synodical (doctrines)."—The same, p. 193.

"The Church, as some understand it, is the totality[3] of all and whosoever have believed in the preaching of the Gospel. But others interpret it as the totality only of those who are Orthodox and in every respect in a state of well-being in regard to Christianity. The Creed of the Holy Œcumenical Councils says, 'I believe in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.' The Fathers called her One because of the uniformity and singleness of the Faith. One Faith, says the Apostle, One Baptism. Holy because they of whom she consists are holy, being hallowed by the All-Holy Spirit of God. Catholic because of the unity of the particular and local Churches which are scattered in every place and which in the

[1] τῶν θεοπνεύστων τοῦ θεοφόρου πατέρων. [2] οἰκονομίαν. [3] σύστημα.

common bond of the All-Holy Spirit make One Catholic Church. Apostolic because she possesses in full the teaching of the Apostles and has nothing false or extraneous to it.[1] Church because she has not been gathered together of herself, but One, even the One God in Trinity, has called her to her calling. . . . We believe not in the Holy Church as in God nor as being omnipotent, but only as being altogether true[2] inasmuch as being led and guided by God and being unable to be turned from the right path."—*Kritopoulos*, p. 316.

" The first mark of the Church is that all her teachers and pastors agree with each other in everything."—The same, p. 318.

" The traditions of the Church which the Holy Spirit has delivered[3] without writing and mystically are termed the Unwritten Word of God. As such are regarded the traditions concerning the rites of the Holy Sacraments and other helpful things which adorn the Church."—The same, p. 319.

"Among them all (sc. the four Patriarchs, and other hierarchs) there is the most complete harmony in regard to the things of Religion so that if anywhere ever the Peace which the Lord gave His Church . . . may be seen flourishing in full vigour in the Eastern Church. Let no one tell me, indeed, that where there is much wisdom and many sciences, there are also many opinions and where there is ignorance there is harmony. . . . For the Holy Fathers possessed much wisdom and many sciences, but none could find two of the Holy Fathers disagreeing with each other. . . . Further, between the four Patriarchs there exists equality such as truly is becoming to Christian pastors. For none of them is lifted up above the others, nor accounts himself in any way to be rightly called the head of the Catholic Church. . . . Such a head of the Catholic Church is Jesus Christ.

[1] νόθων καὶ ἐπιφύλων. [2] ἀληθεύουσαν κατὰ πάντα. [3] παράδωκε.

And it is in unison with this eternally living head that the Church has life, being governed and directed by Him . . . knowing this, the four most holy and blessed Patriarchs of the whole Church, the Apostles' successors and the Truth's defenders, are determined to name no one as an universal head, but are sufficed with the beforementioned head."—The same, cap. 23, p. 359.

"Further, every Orthodox Christian ought, firmly and without doubting, to believe all the Articles of Faith[1] that the Catholic and Orthodox Church believeth; which were delivered[2] unto the Church from our Lord Jesus Christ by the Apostles; and which have been expounded and approved[3] by General Councils.[4] . . . The Articles of Faith have received their Authority and Approbation[5] partly from the Holy Scriptures, partly from Ecclesiastical Tradition, and the doctrines of Councils and of the Holy Fathers. . . The Precepts[6] of the Church are of two kinds, the one committed to writing, which are contained in the Divine books of sacred Scripture, and the other delivered from the Apostles by Word of Mouth.[7] These are the same which the Councils and holy Fathers did afterwards more at large declare."—*Mogila*, i, 4.

"It instructs us that every Christian ought to submit himself and be obedient to the Church. . . . The Church is so fully empowered that she hath authority, in her general Councils, to examine and warrant the Scripture, to enquire into the behaviour and judge of Patriarchs, Popes, Bishops, and all others, and to inflict severe Canonical punishment upon them accordng to their offences. For it is the Pillar and the Ground of Truth."—The same, i, 86.

"Secondly, it is requisite that he who goeth about to

[1] τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς πίστεως.
[2] παραδεδομένα ἀπό.
[3] ἐδοκίμασαν.
[4] αἱ οἰκουμενικαὶ σύνοδοι
[5] τὸ κῦρος καὶ δοκιμασίαν.
[6] δόγματα.
[7] διδάσκεσθαι.

pray should be a son of the Catholic and Orthodox Church; for whosoever has not the Church for a Mother neither can he have God for his Father."—The same, ii, 10.

". . . We believe all the Faithful, and only the Faithful, are members[1] of the Catholic Church, that is, they who embrace the Faith of our Saviour Jesus Christ (delivered by Christ Himself and by His Apostles and by the Holy and Œcumenical Synods) and keep it inviolable, although some of them may be guilty of all manner of sins."—Dositheus, xi, p. 150.

"We believe the Catholic Church is instructed by the Holy Ghost. . . . But the Holy Spirit does not illuminate all the members of the Church by immediate[2] inspiration, but by the instruction of the Holy Fathers and the governors of the Catholic Church. For as the Holy Scripture is, and is called the Word of the Holy Ghost, not that it was immediately delivered to us by Him but by the Apostles and Prophets, so the Church also is taught by the life-giving Spirit, by the immediate[3] instruction of the Holy Fathers and Doctors (whose rule[4] is the Holy and Œcumenical Synods, as we shall not cease to say a thousand times. . . . For the Holy Ghost constantly operating by the Holy Fathers and governors, removes all error from the Church."—The same, xii, p. 150.

"Our holy unspotted and immaculate Faith, the Faith of the Holy and Orthodox and Oriental Church, has never admitted any Doctrine foreign and disagreeable to that of our Lord and Saviour; but always holds and adheres to that and that only which she has received from our Saviour Christ Himself in the Holy and Divine Writings. That is to say, what the Apostles have taught, and the Holy and Œcumenical Synods have decreed, confirmed and delivered to us. . . . We have a third

[1] μέλη.
[2] οὐκ ἀμέσως.
[3] διὰ μέσου.
[4] κανὼν.

proof that our Oriental Faith is the only true Faith, and that it is the same which was preached by our Saviour and confirmed by the Holy Apostles and the Sacred Œcumenical Councils, and that besides this, and this only, there is no other Faith."—*The Patriarchs' Answer to the Non-Jurors*, 1718, pp. 15, 18.

"For we receive the Laws and Canons of the seven ancient, Holy and Sacred Councils, and the particular Synods held in the East (from the Apostolical age unto the reign of Copronymus in Constantinople) as the Holy Scriptures."—The same, p. 49.

"But if ever there was any condescension or dispensation allowed, it was only in matters of practice and order and long custom by way of prudence, but not in matters of Faith and Doctrine . . . For in matters of Holy Doctrine there is no room for condescension or dispensation, they being perpetual and reverently observed by all the Orthodox as immovable. And he that transgresses the least of these, is condemned and anathematized as a schismatic and heretic, and is by everybody looked upon as an excommunicated person."—The same, p. 50.

"Concerning the Catholic Orthodox Church of Christ, we say that it is infallible; as being under the direction of its proper head which is Christ, who is Truth itself, under the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth."—*Synodical Answer to the Lovers of the Greek Church in Britain*, sent from Constantinople 1672, Williams, p. 73.

"That those Doctrines have been long since examined, and rightly and religiously defined and settled by the Holy and Œcumenical Synods, and that it is neither lawful to add anything to them or take anything from them: and that those who are disposed to agree with us in the Divine Doctrines of the Orthodox Faith must necessarily follow and submit to what has been defined and determined by the Decision of the Ancients and Fathers of the Holy and Œcumenical Synods from

the time of the Apostles and their Holy Successors."—*Patriarchs' Final Answer to Non-Jurors*, 1723, Williams, p. 119.

"As for matters of Custom and Ecclesiastical Order, and for the form and discipline of administering the Sacraments; they will be easily settled when once a Union is effected. For it is evident from ecclesiastical history that there both have been and now are different customs and regulations in different places and Churches; and yet the Unity of Faith and Doctrine is preserved the same."—The same, p. 118.

"Hold firmly the sacred dogmas of our blameless Faith which have been handed down from our fathers, and the definitions and canons and the traditions and laws, written and unwritten, of the Church; as our Holy Church received them and was taught them by the Saviour . . . by the Apostles, the Œcumenical Councils and all the Holy Fathers who were inspired by the Holy Spirit and as she has preserved them in succession[1] until to-day without diminution or adulteration."—*Encyclical of Gregory VI against the Heterodox*, 1836, Gedeon, p. 200.

"The very same (sc. Faith) as the many great and glorious Fathers of the Catholic Church in all parts of the earth . . . both by their synodical and their individual[2] teachings have handed it down."—*Gregory VI's Answer to Pius IX*, 1848.

"The Orthodoxy of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, by the living Word of God, alone endures for ever."—The same, p. 6.

"Our Faith . . . not of men nor by men, but by Revelation of Jesus Christ, which the Divine Apostles preached, the Holy Œcumenical Councils confirmed,[3] the greatest and wisest teachers of the world[4] handed down in succession and the shed blood of the Holy Martyrs ratified

[1] ἀλληλοδιαδόχως.
[2] συνοδικῶς καὶ ἰδίᾳ.
[3] ἐκράτυναν.
[4] τῆς οἰκουμένης.

. . . He that accepts a novelty[1] reproaches with deficiency the preached Catholic Faith. But that Faith has long ago been sealed in completeness not to admit of diminution or increase or any change whatever; and he who dares to do or think or advise of such a thing has already denied the Faith of Christ, has already of his own accord been struck with an eternal anathema for blaspheming the Holy Ghost as not having spoken fully in[2] the Scriptures and through[3] the Œcumenical Councils."—The same, p. 28.

"The august Œcumenical Councils, those seven pillars of the house of Wisdom."—The same, p. 29.

"Return to the basis of the seven holy Œcumenical Councils which have been assembled in the Holy Spirit of representatives of all the holy Churches of God, for the determination of the right teaching of the Faith against heretics, and have a universal and perpetual supremacy in the Church of Christ."—*Constantinople Letter*, 1895, p. 17.

"So long as the latter (sc. Rome) perseveres in her innovations, and the Orthodox Church adheres to the divine and apostolic traditions and institutions of the first nine centuries of Christianity, during which the Western Churches were of the same mind and were united with the Churches of the East, so long is it a vain and empty thing to talk of union."—The same, p. 19.

"But however that may be, for the practical realization of the pious longing for the union of the Churches, a common principle and basis must be settled first of all: and there can be no such safe and common principle and basis other than the teaching of the Gospel and of the seven holy Œcumenical Councils."—The same, p. 21.

"The Eastern and Orthodox Catholic Church of Christ holds fast the anciently transmitted doctrines which were at that time professed in common both in the East and West."—The same, p. 25.

[1] νεωτερισμόν. [2] ἐν. [3] διά

"Having recourse to the Fathers and the Œcumenical Councils of the Church of the first nine centuries, we are fully persuaded that the Bishop of Rome was never considered as the supreme and infallible head of the Church, and that every bishop is head and president[1] of his own particular[2] Church, subject only to the synodical ordinances and decisions of the Church universal as being alone infallible,[3] the Bishop of Rome being in no wise excepted from the rule, as Church history shows."—The same, p. 37.

"Each particular self-governing Church, both in the East and West, was totally independent and self-administered[4] in the times of the seven Œcumenical Councils. And just as the bishops of the self-governing[5] Churches of the East, so also those of Africa, Spain, Gaul, Germany, and Britain managed the affairs of their own Churches, each by their local Synods, the Bishop of Rome having no right to interfere, and he himself also was equally subject and obedient to the decrees[6] of Synods. But on important questions which needed the sanction of the universal Church an appeal was made to an Œcumenical Council, which alone was and is the supreme tribunal[7] in the universal Church. Such was the ancient constitution of the Church; but the bishops were independent of each other, and each entirely free within his own bounds, obeying only the synodical decrees, and they sat as equal one to another in Synods."—The same, pp. 43, 45.

"The Orthodox Eastern Church then justly glories in Christ as being the Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils and the first nine centuries of Christianity, and therefore the one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ."—The same, p. 53.

[1] *πρόεδρος.*
[2] *κατὰ μέρος.*
[3] *ἀποφάσεσιν . . ἀλανθάστοις.* n.b. Infallibility is predicted here of the decrees of the Councils.
[4] *ἀνεξάρτητος καὶ αὐτοδιοίκητος.*
[5] *αὐτοκεφάλων.*
[6] *ἀποφάσεις.*
[7] *ἀνώτατον κριτήριον.*

"It is moreover manifest that the universal Church of God, which holds fast in its bosom unique, unadulterated and entire this salutary[1] faith as a divine deposit, just as it was of old delivered and unfolded[2] by the God-fearing Fathers moved by the Spirit, and formulated by them during the first nine centuries, is one and the same for ever, and not manifold and varying with the process of time."—The same, p. 59.

"Come back for the future into the bosom of the one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of God, which consists of all the particular holy Churches of God, which being divinely planted, like luxuriant vines throughout the Orthodox world, are inseparably united to each other in the unity of the one saving faith in Christ, and in the bond of peace and of the Spirit."—The same, p. 63.

"If the bishops, when their hearts are so inclined, stimulated by the duties laid upon them as chief pastors, assemble themselves together, and without dissimulation, regarding themselves as before the face of Christ Himself, Who, in very truth, has promised to be in the midst of those who are gathered together in His Name, with a pure conscience, and with unanimous prayer, pronounce before all the world the confession of their faith, or lay down a decision healing the disorders and wounds in the Church, then the Holy Ghost, dwelling in the Church universal, and moving her, without doubt speaks, in such a case by the mouths of the Bishops who have assembled themselves together in prayer, although each one of them acknowledge himself to be the most sinful of men."—*Russian Epistle*, 1903, pp. 11 and 12.

"May it ever be that in cases when in some local Church any kind of reform has to be entered upon which deeply affects the established order of the Church, when this local Church is required to pronounce, or there has

[1] σωτήριον. [2] ὑπετυπώθη.

been already pronounced, a sentence upon any kind of religious movement, more particularly if its influence may be supposed to extend beyond the bounds of the Church in question—may it ever be that on such occasions the representative of that Church, by means of an Epistle or in some other way, shall inform the representatives likewise of the other local Orthodox Churches, asking of their brotherly experience for their advice, and putting them in possession of the facts of what has taken place in his own region. Such constant mutual help and sharing in a common life will without doubt serve as a real and living bond, strengthening all the local Churches in the one body growing up into 'an habitation of God through the Spirit.' But likewise in its own particular life each autocephalous Orthodox Church must always (as, indeed, it does at present) preserve the memory and consciousness of its union with the other Orthodox Churches, and of the fact that only in Communion and agreement with them has it the pledge of truth and of eternal life, or manifests itself as the Church of God, and that, if it has lost this Communion and union, it must perish and wither as a branch which has fallen away from the vine. May the constant and active introduction into their life and ecclesiastical practice of this *principle of Œcumenicity*,[1] the training of a feeling of its necessity in his ecclesiastical community, be the subject of the special care of the wise representative of the local Churches."—The same, p. 13.

"At the same time a firm profession of the truth of our Œcumenical Church as the one guardian of the inheritance of Christ and the one saving ark of Divine Grace."—The same, p. 16.

"Our Eastern-Orthodox Church, which has inviolably preserved the complete deposit of Christ, is alone at

[1] Vselenskosti.

the present time the Œcumenical Church."—The same, p. 18.

"I believe that the Church is an uniformity of opinion among Christians who retain the Doctrines of Christ as they have been delivered by the Apostles and explained by the Fathers and General Councils. I further believe the Government of the Church to be Hierarchical, consisting chiefly in the Power which Bishops and Presbyters have to preach the Word of Life to the people, to exercise the Power of the Keys, that is to pronounce forgiveness of sins to those that are penitent."—*Resenki's Russian Catechism*, 1718, p. 35.

"By the name Holy Tradition is meant the Doctrine of the Faith, the law of God, the Sacraments, and the ritual as handed down by the true believers and worshippers of God by word and example from one to another, and from generation to generation.

"All true believers united by the Holy Traditions of the Faith collectively and successively, by the will of God, compose the Church; and she is the sure repository of Holy Tradition. . . . The necessity of tradition is further evident from this, that books can be available only to a small part of mankind, but tradition to all.

"We must follow that tradition which agrees with the Divine Revelation and with Holy Scripture, as is taught us by Scripture itself. . . . As a guide to the right understanding of Holy Scripture, for the right ministrations of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity of their original institution." — *Longer Russian Catechism*, pp. 35, 36.

An Œcumenical Council is "an assembly of the Pastors and Doctors of the Catholic Church of Christ, as far as possible, from the whole world, for the confirmation of true doctrine and holy discipline among Christians."—The same, p. 45.

"The words of Jesus Christ Himself, which give to

the decisions of the Church such weight, that whoever disobeys them is left deprived of grace as a heathen. But the means by which the Œcumenical Church utters her decisions is an Œcumenical Council."—The same, p. 45.

The Church is a divinely instituted community of men, united by the Orthodox Faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the Sacraments. Our duty " is piously to honour the true Church of Christ, and to obey her doctrines and commandments, from a conviction that grace ever abides in her, and works, teaches, and governs unto salvation, flowing from her One only everlasting Head, the Lord Jesus Christ."—The same, p. 75.

"These are particular Churches, or parts of the one Catholic Church; the separateness of their visible organization does not hinder them from being all spiritually great members of the one body of the Universal Church, from having one Head, Christ, and one Spirit of Faith and Grace. This unity is expressed outwardly by unity of Creed, and by Communion in Prayer and Sacraments."—The same, p. 77.

The Church " alone has the sublime promises that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; that the Lord shall be with her even to the end of the world; that in her shall abide the glory of God in Jesus Christ throughout all generations for ever; and consequently that she shall never apostatize from the Faith, nor sin against the truth of the Faith, or fall into error. . . . Since Jesus Christ, in the words of St. Paul, is the Head of the Church, and He is the Saviour of the Body, it follows that to have part in His salvation, we must necessarily be members of His Body, that is of the Catholic Church (Ephes. v. 23)."—The same, p. 81.

"The Church is a community of men who are bound together by the same Faith in Jesus Christ, and by the same Sacraments and governed by canonical bishops. The True, One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church,

which is designated by the Creed, is our Orthodox Eastern Church."—*Moschake*, pp. 34, 35.

"By the Church we mean the whole body of Christians, that is the whole body of men who believe in Jesus Christ, have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, and believe what Holy Scripture, tradition and the *Seven Œcumenical Councils teach*."—*Bernardakis' Catechism*, p. 17.

"The only true Church of Christ is the Eastern-Orthodox Church, which is called Eastern 'Because most of the Christians of this Church live in the East,' and Orthodox, 'Because it judges rightly, that is it professes and teaches the right dogmas of the Christian Faith, as it received them from Christ, and from the Apostles, and as the Seven Œcumenical Councils explained them.'"—The same, p. 19.

"The bishops being invested with the authority to govern the Church, the Councils established rules in the order of the Church . . . The councils divided it into five patriarchates, which in their turn were divided into primacies, provinces or metropolies, and into dioceses, or simple bishoprics. This order as well as the titles and names conditioned by it, are merely Church institutions."—*Guetté*, pp. 170. 171.

"One of the bishops' rights is to represent the totality of the parish Churches, which are under them and form the diocese, and also to state the Faith accepted firmly by the Church. Of the totality of the bishops' statements is formed the unchangeable Œcumenical statements of the Church concerning matters of doctrine. The infallibility is the characteristic of just these statements, when they are invariably the same and universal. . . . If the Church were not infallible, that is if it could break away from truth, it would not be the pillar and foundation of truth."—The same, p. 171.

"The Church is infallible and is expressed by its chief pastors, when they all bear witness to an invariable and

universal belief, each for his own local Church and in harmony with the priests, the deacons and the believers of his Church. In this case, the episcopate is an infallible organ of the Church, being the representative and the echo of the Œcumenical Church of all the times."—The same, p. 172.

"The whole Church, composed of the believers and their pastors, is helped by the Holy Ghost and manifests its infallibility by the constant announcement of revealed truth. By Divine Right it has Jesus Christ for the central point of its unity and His truth which was borne witness to by the invariable Œcumenical voice of all the Christian centuries, of which the episcopate is an interrupted echo. The exterior centre of authority is the whole totality of bishops, which is one, and which is represented in the words of St. Cyprian, by all the lawful bishops in their totality. These are the truths, confirmed by the Œcumenical Councils and the Holy Fathers, bearing witness to the Œcumenical Traditions which are rejected by the claims of Roman bishops."—The same, p. 177.

II. THE NATURE AND NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS

"In the totality of Orthodox Christianity there are seven Sacraments[1] with their rites,[2] viz.: Baptism, Chrism[3] of Divine Myron, Ordination, Marriage, Repentance and Holy Oil.[4] For there are seven Charismata of the Holy Spirit, as Isaiah says, and there are also seven Sacraments of the Church. For their distinguishing character shows that they alone are Sacraments and that they are not more in number. For a Sacrament has relation to human birth (as marriage), or to human salvation (as the Ordering of

[1] ἑπτὰ μυστήρια.
[2] τελεταί.
[3] χρίσμα θείου μύρου.
[4] ἅγιον ἔλαιον.

priests) and that which is wrought in them and through them as in the case of Baptism, Myron and Communion, is helpful to every man; or in the case of Ordination is helpful to the hallowed just as marriage is to the laity; or in the case of Repentance and the Anointing with Holy Oil is helpful to those who sin after Baptism, inasmuch as they give the grace of forgiveness of sins and cleanse the spots of sin which are on the soul. And they are called Sacraments on account of that which is comprehensible in them by perceptible symbols,[1] having an accomplished though indescribable part. And each of these Sacraments has been instituted[2] in Scripture and possesses both its matter and form[3] and also its efficient, or rather organic, instrument.[4] For example, in Baptism the matter is water, the form is the words of the priest . . . and the organic instrument is the priest."—*Jeremiah* i, p. 140.

"Baptism and Holy Communion, without which it is impossible to be saved, are of the greatest importance among the Sacraments; still the Church has handed down these others, I mean to make the number seven."—The same, p. 228.

"There are three Sacraments[5] which are necessary for Salvation: Baptism, Communion, Repentance; for the same threats and promises which He uttered about the one, He uttered about the other two. . . . Except ye repent ye shall all perish. . . . In addition to these three Sacraments there are certain mystic rites[6] called by the same name as they, viz. Sacraments, in the Church because of the mystic and spiritual character contained in them, such as the Holy Chrism received immediately after Baptism, the Ordering of Priests, first marriage,[7] and Euchelaion."[8]—*Kritopoulos*, p. 313.

"A mystery is a certain holy Rite or Ceremony which,

[1] ἐν αἰσθητοῖς συμβόλοις.
[2] τεθεσμοθέτηται.
[3] ὕλην καὶ εἶδος.
[4] ποιητικόν, ἢ μᾶλλον ὀργανικόν αἴτιον.
[5] μυστήρια.
[6] τελεταὶ μυστικαί.
[7] ὁ πρῶτος γάμος.
[8] Prayer oil, εὐχέλαιον.

under a visible show, causes and conveys[1] into the Soul of the Faithful the invisible Grace of God; an Institution of our Lord, whereby every one of the Faithful receiveth the Divine Grace."—*Mogila*, p. 74.

"The three requisites of a Sacrament: First, fit and proper matter,[2] as water in Baptism, bread and wine in the Eucharist, oil and other things in their respective Mysteries. Secondly, a bishop or a priest, regularly ordained. Thirdly, the Invocation[3] of the Holy Ghost, and a solemn form of words[4]: By which the priest celebrates the Mystery, through the power and efficacy of the Holy Ghost: Having a fixed and deliberate intention[5] of celebrating it."—*Mogila* i, p. 100.

"We believe there are Sacraments of the Gospel,[6] and that they are seven. For we have neither more nor fewer Sacraments in the Church. . . . For the septenary number of the Sacraments is no less established[7] by the Gospel than the other Doctrines of the Catholic Faith."—*Dositheus*, p. 153.

"The Sacraments consist of something natural and something supernatural[8]; neither are they bare signs[9] of the promises of God. . . . We believe them to be instruments[10] by which Divine grace is necessarily communicated to those who receive them."—*Dositheus*, p. 154.

"A Sacrament is a divine and holy thing which as to one part is visible to the eyes and as to another part is enigmatical and to do with the mind,[11] giving evidence under material and sensible forms,[12] of the immaterial and spiritual grace[13] which the great God imparts to

[1] τὸ μύστήριον εἶναι μία τελετή, ἡ ὁποία ἀποκάτω εἰς κάποιον εἶδος ὁρατὸν εἶναι αἰτία καὶ φέρει.
[2] ὕλη ἁρμόδιος.
[3] ἐπίκλησις.
[4] εἶδος.
[5] γνώμην ἀποφασισμένην.
[6] τὰ εὐαγγελικά μυστήρια.
[7] νομοθετεῖται.
[8] συγκεῖται τὰ μυστήρια ἐκ τοῦ φυσικοῦ καὶ ὑπεφυοῦς.
[9] ψιλὰ σημεῖα.
[10] ὄργανα δραστικά.
[11] ὑπαινίττεται καὶ νοεῖ.
[12] ὑλικὰ καὶ αἰσθητὰ εἴδη.
[13] τὴν ἄυλον καὶ πνευματικὴν χάριν.

those who receive it worthily. Thus in the Eucharist, even if we see bread and wine after the Consecration, it is not simple bread and wine, but Christ is hidden under those forms."—*Bulgaris*, p. 3.

"The especially necessary things (in a Sacrament) are four, the matter, the form, the efficient cause,[1] and the end on which the priest's mind is fixed."[2]—The same, p. 9.

"The efficient cause is the Paraclete Himself. . . . The end is spiritual salvation and the absolution of sins."—The same, p. 11.

"We hold, likewise, that the Holy Sacraments are seven in number, but two only exceed in necessity, and are such as no one can be saved without them."—*The Patriarchs' Answer to the Nonjurors*, 1718, p. 46.

"We declare . . . that we enjoy seven holy and venerable Sacraments, cœval with the Gospel, and all of them true and necessary unto the salvation of the faithful."—*Synodical Answer to the Lovers of the Greek Church in Britain*, sent from Constantinople, 1672, Williams, p. 67.

"We believe, confess and maintain without doubt that our Faith is the only true religion,[3] the only worship[4] pleasing to God, and the only path of salvation[5] and we hold it fast without diminution, abrasion or change just as we received it from . . . our Lord, the Holy Apostles, the Divine Fathers and of our Church. We will accept no addition to or withdrawal from our Seven Holy Sacraments."—*Encyclical against the Lutherans, Gregory VI*, 1836, Gedeon, p. 264.

"A Mystery or Sacrament is a holy act, through which grace, or, in other words, the saving power of God, works mysteriously upon man."—*Longer Russian Catechism*, p. 84.

Now, the Sacraments are sacred rites,[6] which have

[1] ποιητικὸν αἴτιον.
[2] τελικόν.
[3] θρησκεία.
[4] λατρεία.
[5] σωτήριος ὁδός.
[6] τελεταί.

been ordained[1] by Jesus Christ and His Apostles, and in which, under visible signs, the invisible grace of the Holy Spirit is communicated[2] to Christians. The Sacraments are seven in number . . . The most essential[3] of the seven are Baptism and the Eucharist, because by Baptism we become members of the Church and by the Eucharist we are made one with Christ. And of the other Sacraments, Confirmation and Confession are Sacraments binding upon every Christian; but Priesthood, Marriage and Unction are matters of choice." —*Moschake*, p. 41.

"All the sacred acts, such as the prayers and supplications of the priest and of the faithful by which the administration of the Sacraments is accompanied, come under the name of a sacred rite." — *Bernardakis' Catechism*, p. 20.

III. HOLY CHRISM OR CONFIRMATION

" It is necessary that the baptised be chrismated immediately with the Myron.[4] For this Chrism is the seal of Christ and sign. Moreover, in receiving Grace from Him, we are called Christians through the Holy Oil and are the Lord's anointed.[5] . . . Therefore in anointing the baptised, the priest says, 'The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Ghost, Amen.'[6] Wherefore it obtains rightly that Chrism follows Baptism and is not reserved for another season, and also that the baptised receive the awesome Communion. For the end of every Sacrament is that we who have been freed from error and made clean from sin's stain and who have been sealed with divine Myron, may have the Communion of His Body and Blood and be completely united with Him, and that Christ

[1] ὡρίσθησαν.
[2] μεταδίδεται.
[3] οὐσιωδέστερα.
[4] χρίειν . . τῷ μύρῳ
[5] χριστοί.
[6] σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἀμήν.

may dwell and move with us and abide with us all our days."—*Jeremiah*, i, p. 129.

"We are anointed with Christ in order that we may be sharers in the royal Chrism, the being made divine."—The same, p. 226.

"The Church orders those who have been counted worthy to have received Holy Baptism to be anointed immediately with the Holy Oil which has been prepared beforehand by the hierarchs by whom it is distributed to all the Churches which are under their administration. . . . Further, as it was the custom when royal treasures were placed in skin bags to seal them, so the Church, when Baptism, which is the greatest and most royal of treasures, has been conferred, sets the Holy Oil as a kind of royal seal upon the baptised after the fashion of skin bags."—*Kritopoulos*, cap. 8, p. 321.

"The Church ordains that those who have been counted worthy of Holy Baptism should forthwith be anointed with holy Myron[2] prepared beforehand by the chief bishops,[3] by whom it is distributed to all the Churches under their government."—*Kritopoulos*, p. 321.

"The Ointment of Chrism is the second Mystery; and this had its Beginning at the Time when the Holy Ghost came down from Heaven and rested upon the Apostles . . . when the Priest anointeth the newly baptised Person with the holy Oil, he becomes endued from above with the Gifts[4] of the Holy Spirit: As appears from the Words which the Priest (as appointed) useth in the Celebration of this Mystery; namely, The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Ghost, Amen. As if he should say, By the anointing[5] of this holy Ointment thou art sealed and confirmed[6] into the Gifts of the Holy Ghost which thou dost receive for a confirmation of thy Christian Faith. First, It is necessary that this Holy

[1] τοῦ χρίσματος τοῦ βασιλικοῦ, τῆς θεωσέως.
[2] ἁγίῳ μύρῳ.
[3] ἀρχιερέων.
[4] χαρίσματα.
[5] χρίσιν.
[6] βεβαιώνεσαι.

Ointment be consecrated by a Bishop of the highest Order.[1] Secondly, That it be composed of apt and fit Material[2] as Oil, Balsam, and other Unguents."—*Mogila*, i, 104, 105.

"For without Chrism none can be a perfect Christian; that being the seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit, which was imposed as necessary both in the ancient and present Church."—*Patriarchs' Answer to Nonjurors*, 1718, p. 47.

"The consecration of the Holy Chrism as being its privilege . . . has been attached alone to the great Church of Constantinople as the common mother of all Orthodox, and nowhere else except there, the Patriarch and Synod being present, is it prescribed that the Holy Chrism should be prepared and distributed to all the Churches of the Orthodox."—*Encyclical of the Œcumenical Patriarch Agathangellos*, 1826, Gedeon, p. 177.

"The end[3] of Holy Chrism is to give the Christian power freely to confess the Name of Christ, and especially His precious Cross."—*Bulgaris*, p. 11.

"In fact this Sacrament serves as the seal and confirmation[4] with regard to the gift of the Holy Spirit, which the anointed received in Baptism, in order that he might advance to every good work."—*Moschake*, p. 43.

IV. THE EUCHARIST: THE REAL PRESENCE AND SACRIFICE

"The Lord . . . after eating it in the manner delivered to Moses, delivered it as a sacrifice of Communion[5] . . . enjoining them to celebrate it as His Memorial[6] and to know that as often as they celebrated it, they showed forth the Death of their Lord."—*Jeremiah* i, p. 143.

[1] τὸν ἀνωτάτω Ἐπίσκοπον.
[2] τὴν πρεπουμένην του ὕλην.
[3] τέλος.
[4] ἐπιβεβαίωσις.
[5] κοινὴν θυσίαν.
[6] ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν.

"For the consecration of the Gifts is the Sacrifice[1] and shows forth His Death, Resurrection and Ascension, for He changes[2] these gifts into the Body of the Lord."—*Jeremiah* i, 157.

"The Consecrated Bread is truly (the) Body of Christ, and that which is in the cup (the) Blood of Christ without doubt. But the method of such change[3] is unknowable and not to be interpreted by us. For clear vision in such matters has been dispensed to the elect in the Kingdom of Heaven in order that through single and incurious Faith they may obtain greater grace from God."—*Kritopoulos*, p. 327.

"The Reserved Sacrament[4] always remains a Holy Sacrament and never loses the holiness which it has once received. . . . The holiness in this Sacrament remains[5] ineffacable for ever. . . . We do not carry this Sacrament through the streets except to the houses of the sick. For it was not given to us to be carried about."—The same, p. 329.

"In the Moments of Consecration of the Holy Gifts,[6] the Priest must firmly and undoubtingly resolve within himself that the Substance[7] of the Bread and the Substance of the Wine are changed into the very Substance[8] of the very Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, by the operation or working of the Holy Ghost, whose Power and Influence let the Priest invoke in these Words, in order to the due Performance of this Mystery: O Lord, send down from Heaven Thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts now lying before Thee; and make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit. At these Words there is wrought the Change[9] in the Elements, and the very Bread

[1] θυσία.
[2] μεταβάλλει
[3] μεταβολῆς.
[4] τὸ ταμιευόμενον μυστήριον.
[5] ἀνεξάλειπτος.
[6] ὅπου ἁγιάζει τὰ δῶρα.
[7] οὐσία.
[8] μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν.
[9] μετουσίωσις.

becomes the very Body of Christ, and the Wine His very Blood; the Species only[1] remaining, which are perceived by the Sight. . . . This Holy Mystery is also offered as a Sacrifice for all Orthodox Christians as well living as those who sleep . . . and this Sacrifice shall never fail, nor be discontinued, even unto the End of the World."—*Mogila*, i, 107.

"We are hereby taught that the Body of Christ is in Heaven only and not in earth after the manner[2] it used to be while He conversed among us: but only after a Sacramental manner[3]; whereby, in the Holy Supper, the same Son of God, God and Man, is present on Earth by a change of Substance,[4] for the Substance of the Bread is changed[5] into the Substance of His most Holy Body, and the Substance of the Wine into the Substance of His most precious Blood. Wherefore we ought to glorify and reverence[6] the Holy Eucharist as our Saviour Jesus Himself."—The same, i, 56.

"In the Celebration of the Sacrament we believe our Lord Jesus Christ to be present, not typically[7] or figuratively,[8] nor by a greater degree of grace as in the other Sacraments, nor by a bare presence,[9] as some of the Fathers speak concerning Baptism, nor by conjunction,[10] whereby the Divinity is substantially united to the Eucharistic Bread,[11] as the Lutherans foolishly and wretchedly suppose; but truly and really.[12] For the Bread and Wine after Consecration are changed, transubstantiated, converted, transformed,[13] the Bread into the true Body of our Lord which was born in Bethlehem of the ever Virgin . . . The Wine also is changed and transubstantiated into[14] the very Blood of our Lord,

[1] τὰ εἴδη.
[2] κατὰ τὸν τρόπον τῆς σαρκός.
[3] κατὰ τον μυστηριώδη τρόπον.
[4] κατὰ μετουσίωσιν.
[5] ἡ οὐσία . . . μεταβάλλεται.
[6] λατρεύωμεν, i.e. with divine worship.
[7] τυπικῶς.
[8] εἰκονικῶς.
[9] κατὰ μόνην παρουσίαν.
[10] κατ' ἀναρτισμόν.
[11] ἑνοῦσθαι . . . ὑποστατικῶς.
[12] ἀληθῶς καὶ πραγματικῶς.
[13] μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιοῦσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μεταῤῥυθμίζεσθαι.
[14] μεταποιεῖσθαι καὶ μετουσιοῦσθαι.

which, as He hung on the Cross, flowed from His side for the life of the world. We believe that the substance[1] of Bread and Wine remains no longer, but the very Body and Blood of the Lord, under the form and figures[2] of Bread and Wine, that is under the accidents.[3] . . . Also that under every part or smallest bit of the Bread and Wine there is not a part of the Lord's Body . . . but the entire whole Lord Christ according to His substance: that is with the soul and divinity as He is perfect God and perfect Man. So that though there be many Eucharists celebrated in the world at one and the same hour, there are not many Christs, or many bodies of Christ, but one and the same Christ is present in all and every Church of the Faithful and there is one Body and one Blood. Not that that Body of the Lord which is in Heaven descends upon the Altar; but because that Bread which is laid on the Altar,[4] and there offered in every Church, is by Consecration changed and transubstantiated and made one and the same with that which is in Heaven.

"And for this reason chiefly this Sacrament is, and is called wonderful and comprehensible by Faith alone, and not by the trifling reasonings of man's wisdom, whose vain and foolish reasonings our pious and divinely-taught religion despises.

"Also that the same Body and Blood of the Lord in the Sacrament is to be adored in the highest manner that may be and to be worshipped with Latria.[5] For one and the same worship ought to be paid to the Holy Trinity and to the Body and Blood of the Lord. It is also a true and propitiatory Sacrifice[6] which is offered for all the faithful, both living and dead, and for the benefit of all, as is expressed in the prayers of this Sacra-

[1] οὐσίαν.
[2] εἴδει καὶ τύπῳ.
[3] συμβεβηκόσιν.
[4] ὁ τῆς προθέσεως.
[5] τιμᾶσθαι ὑπερβαλλόντως καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι λατρευτικῶς.
[6] θυσίαν ἱλαστικήν.

ment. . . . Also before the use, immediately after the Consecration[1] and likewise after the use, that which is kept in the Sacred Pixes for Communion of those that are dying, is the true Body of the Lord and not in any the least respect different from what it was ; inasmuch as after Consecration before the use, in the use and after the use, it is in all respects the true Body of the Lord. . . . Lastly, this Sacrament of the Eucharist can, as we believe according to the Doctrine of the Oriental Church, be made by none but by a pious priest and one who has received his character of priesthood from a pious and lawful bishop. . . .

"Nevertheless we do not believe that the word "transubstantiation" perfectly explains the manner by which the Bread and Wine are changed[2] into the Body and Blood of the Lord (for that is altogether impossible, as being to be comprehended by God only ; so that he ought to be looked upon as foolish and impious whosoever thinks he can arrive at the full knowledge of this mystery), but that after Consecration the Bread and Wine are not typically[3] nor figuratively,[4] nor according to superabundant grace, nor by communication,[5] nor by the presence[6] of the Divine Nature alone of the Only-begotten Son of God, changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord. Neither is any accident[7] of the Bread and Wine changed in any manner into an accident of the Body and Blood of Christ ; but the Bread is made truly and substantially[8] the true Body of the Lord and the wine His Blood."—*Dositheus*, cap. xvii, p. 158.

"How can any pious person forbear trembling to hear this blasphemy, as I may venture to term it ? For, to be against worshipping the Bread, which is consecrated and changed into the Body of Christ, is to be against

[1] ἁγιασμόν.
[2] μεταποιοῦνται.
[3] τυπικῶς.
[4] εἰκονικῶς.
[5] κοινωνίᾳ.
[6] παρουσίᾳ.
[7] συμβεβηκός.
[8] οὐσιωδῶς

worshipping our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, our Maker and Saviour. For, what else is the sacrificial Bread, after it is consecrated and transubstantiated by the access of the Holy Spirit ? Truly, nothing less than the real Body of our Lord."—*Patriarchs' Answer to Nonjurors*, 1718, p. 57.

"Which Sacrament is and is called Latria ; and therein the Deified Body of Christ our Saviour is worshipped with divine worship ; and is offered up as a Sacrifice for all Orthodox Christians living and dead."—*Synodical Answer to the Lovers of the Greek Church in Britain, sent from Constantinople* 1672, *Williams*, p. 70.

"The end[1] of the Holy Liturgy is that the Lamb of God may be offered as a sacrifice[2] for the sins of the world, whom whosoever receives in purity and faith is united with Christ."—*Bulgaris*, p. 12.

"The Communion is a Sacrament, in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life.

"The most essential part of the Liturgy is the utterance of the words which Jesus Christ spake in instituting the Sacrament : 'Take, eat, this is My Body.'

"At the moment of this act, the bread and wine are changed, or transubstantiated, into the very Body of Christ, and into the very Blood of Christ.

"In the exposition of the Faith by the Eastern Patriarchs, it is said that the word 'transubstantiation' is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord ; for this none can understand but God ; but only this much is signified, that the bread, truly, really and substantially becomes the very true Body of the Lord, and the wine the very Blood of the Lord."—*Longer Russ Catechism*, pp. 90-2.

[1] τέλος. [2] θυσιάζηται.

"The Eucharist is a Sacrament in which, by partaking[1] of the bread and of the wine, we partake of the very Body and Blood of Christ. Great is the mystery of the Eucharist, because it represents the death and sacrifice[2] of Jesus on the Cross on our behalf, and by it we are made one with Jesus."—*Moschake*, pp. 43, 44.

"The priest takes bread, and wine with water, which through the prayers of the priest, and the devotions and supplications of the Church, are changed by the Holy Spirit, and the bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the wine His Blood. Thus the Church partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, even though the Holy Communion has the taste not of flesh and blood, but of bread and wine."—*Bernardakis' Catechism*, p. 22.

"It is a special duty to go to Church always when there is a service, but particularly on Sunday to the Divine Liturgy."—The same, p. 28.

V. CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION

"We say, according to Basil the Great, that it is necessary for every Christian who would show noteworthy progress and be in a state of life that is after the Lord's commands, not to keep a disturbance of his soul to himself and without probing it to give no account of it, but to lay bare the secrets of his heart, not to chance persons, but to those who can heal. . . . ."—*Jeremiah*, i, p. 184.

In the Preparation for Communion communicants must (1) be in charity with all; (2) fast in the day; (3) keep vigil the night before; (4) give alms; (5) "Lastly each of the communicants must confess his sins to one of the spiritual fathers appointed for that purpose."—*Kritopoulos*, p. 328.

"That we make confession of our sins to a priest,

[1] μεταλαμβάνοντες. [2] θυσίαν.

rightly and lawfully ordained, four times every year. However, those who are well advanced in Religion and Godliness may discharge this duty every month."—*Mogila*, i, 90.

"The fifth Mystery is Penance, which is a true and thorough sorrow for the sin that a person hath been guilty of, and which he confessed[1] unto the priest, his Spiritual Father, with a full purpose[2] of performing the Penance inflicted by him, and a stedfast Resolution to amend his life for the future. This Mystery is most complete and doth then most fully benefit us when, according to the constitution and customs of the Church, Absolution of Sins is granted by the priest. For as soon as any person receiveth the Absolution of his Sins, they are all forthwith pardoned by God, through the ministration of the priest."—The same, 112.

"He instituted the Sacrament of Penance, in which secret confession in included,[3] when He said, Whosoever sins, etc."—*Dositheus*, cap. xv, p. 154.

"Since Baptism cannot be repeated, yet many may sin after they are baptized, how shall they obtain forgiveness without repentance and confession, and without a person endued with the power of binding and loosing?"—*Patriarchs' Answer to Nonjurors*, 1718, p. 47.

"To examine his conscience before God, and to cleanse it from sin by penitence; for doing which he has helps in fasting and prayer.

"Penitence is a Sacrament, in which he who confesses his sins is, on the outward declaration of pardon by the Priest, inwardly loosed from his sins by Jesus Christ Himself."—*Longer Russ Catechism*, pp. 93-4.

"For this reason the Church ordained the Sacrament of Repentance, which ought[4] to precede the Eucharist."—*Moschake*, p. 44.

"The fourth Sacrament is Penance or Confession.

[1] κατηγορᾷ.
[2] γνώμην.
[3] μετάνοια ἥτινι σύμμικτος ἡ μυστηριακὴ ἐξομολόγησις.
[4] ὀφείλει.

In this Sacrament he who confesses his sins and repents of them from the depth of his soul and heart, invokes the mercy of God, and through the priest receives from God the forgiveness of his sins.

"The priest receives his authority from the bishop, who has it in succession from the Apostles. To the Apostles our Lord Jesus Christ Himself gave this authority."—*Bernardakis' Catechism*, pp. 23, 24.

VI. HOLY ORDERS

"Orders[1] impart the authority and power of the Creator. And since nothing that is, is apart from Him, and He came to lead us to Salvation, having received back this power of His from us, He imparts it to us through the Priesthood,[2] and by it all the Sacramental Rites are accomplished for us; and without a priest there is nothing holy.[3] And further, as at the beginning He made us rulers of things visible, so again in the present time does He make us rulers in a higher sphere. For He gave the Apostles and those who have been hallowed as their successors the keys of heaven."—*Jeremiah*, i, p. 141.

"The Catholic Church allows those alone who have been sealed canonically[4] and called and ordained[5] as the Tradition of the Church requires and hold no evil heresy, to preach and to minister. . . . For it declares to be in error them who account it a matter of indifference whether the Holy and Divine Sacraments be ministered by laymen ordained haphazard or by those who are hallowed and ordained canonically."—*Jeremiah*, i, 163.

"Holy Orders, or the Priesthood[6]; and this is twofold —the one spiritual, the other sacramental. Of the former, namely, the spiritual Priesthood, all Christians

[1] χειροτία.
[2] ἱερωσύνης.
[3] οὐδὲν ἅγιον χωρὶς ἱερέως.
[4] ἐσφραγισμένους κανονικῶς.
[5] χειροτονηθέντας.
[6] Ἱερωσύνη.

in general are equally endowed and do exercise it in common. . . .

"The Priesthood, which is a Mystery,[1] is that which Christ delivered[2] to his Apostles; which is handed down unto this day, by their laying on of hands,[3] and by the laying on of hands of Bishops, who are the Successors[4] of the Apostles, to dispense[5] the divine Mysteries, and to perform the Ministry of the Salvation of Mankind. . . . By this kind of Ordination and uninterrupted Succession, those who are sent forth unto this Work have the Power and Permission to preach the Doctrine of Salvation." —*Mogila*, i, 108, 109.

"We believe the Church called, or rather indeed which is, Holy Catholick and Apostolick, and which we are taught to believe, comprehends all the faithful in Christ; . . . Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself is the Head of the Catholic Church, forasmuch as no mortal man can be universally and eternally its head; and keeping the supreme government of the Church to Himself, directs it by the ministry of the Holy Fathers. And therefore the Holy Ghost has appointed bishops over particular Churches. . . . For indeed we say Episcopacy is so necessary that, if that were taken away, there would be neither Church nor Christian. For the bishop being the successor of the Apostles, called to that office by imposition of hands and invocation of the Holy Ghost, having received by a continued succession the power given by God to bind and to loose, is the living image of God upon earth, filled with the powerful assistance of the Holy Spirit which perfects his ministrations, the fountain of all the Sacraments of the Catholick Church by which we obtain salvation. This episcopacy seems to us as necessary to the Church as breath to a man, or the sun to the world. For as it is

[1] μύστυριον, a Sacrament.
[2] διετάχθη.
[3] διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν . . . γίνεται.
[4] διαδεξαμένων.
[5] πρὸς διάδοσιν.

well said by one of the Fathers, you shall hardly find a heretick that is a wise man ; for when they depart from the Church, the Spirit also departs from them ; and being deprived of all understanding and light, they are involved in darkness and blindness."—*Dositheus*, x, pp. 147-150.

" The end of Ordination is to fix the character of divine power and authority in the soul of the priest or hierarch in order that they may be able to perform the Sacraments."—*Bulgaris*, p. 11.

" The Sacrament of the Priesthood is one of the most necessary, for, without this, how shall the Sacrament of the Eucharist be performed ? . . . And how shall Christians have the Sacrament of the Participation of His precious Body and Blood, if there be no Priest to consecrate and perform the sacred Ministration ? For without a Priest not all the Princes and Kings of the earth together can perform this supernatural Mystery and distribute it to the faithful."—*Patriarchs' Answer to Nonjurors*, 1718, p. 46.

" As to the necessity of the High-priesthood to the Church, we say that our great High-priest . . . hath placed in the Church Pastors and Teachers. . . . As necessary therefore as is the edifying the body of the Church, so necessary is the High-priesthood, by which that edification is perfected : and, Christ's being an High-priest for ever . . . can no otherways be effected than by the Priests his successors, in the midst of whom he constantly officiates, and will do so unto the end of the world. But the fountain and source of the Priesthood is no other than the Bishop, . . . nor indeed can be be a Priest, who is not called to that office by episcopal Ordination."—*Synodical Answer to the Lovers of the Greek Church in Britain sent from Constantinople* 1672, *Williams*, p. 71.

" The Church is Apostolic because she has from the Apostles without break or change both her doctrine and

the succession of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, through the laying on of consecrated hands. In the same sense the Church is called also Orthodox, or Rightly-believing. . . . From Jesus Christ Himself, and from the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles ; from which time it is continued in unbroken succession, through the laying on of hands, in the sacrament of Orders."—*Longer Russ Catechism*, pp. 82, 83.

" Priesthood is a Sacrament in which the Bishop lays his hands upon him who is chosen, invokes upon him the Divine grace, and imparts[1] to him the grace of the priesthood."—*Moschake*, p. 45.

" Orders are a Sacrament, in which the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the bishop's hands, ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister sacraments and to feed the flock of Christ."—The same, p. 94.

VII. THE DEAD AND THE SAINTS

" Moreover, mention is made of the Saints in the sacred service,[2] when the Gifts[3] are presented and when they are offered sacrificially. Especially do we then remember the Cross and other symbols of what Christ endured for us. We make mention of the Panaghia[4] and give utterance to her praise. We pray for the mercy of God through the prayers[5] of the Saints, pleading for the living and the dead and for those purposes offering our reasonable worship."[6]—*Jeremiah*, i, 160.

" Invocation[7] in principle is appropriate only to God and first and particularly appertains to Him. But that of the Saints is not in principle but conditioned and according to grace. For it is neither Peter nor Paul that

[1] *μεταδίδει.*
[2] *lepourγία.*
[3] *τὰ δῶρα*, the Oblations.
[4] The Theotokos.
[5] Our Lady.
[6] *λογικὴ λατρεία*, i.e. the Eucharist.
[7] *ἐπίκλησις.*

hearken to those who invoke them, but the grace which they possess, according to the Lord's saying—'I will be with you unto the end.' And because we render Invocation alone to God we ejaculate alone in the Divine Mystic Service, 'Account us worthy, Lord, with boldness and without condemnation to dare to invoke Thee.' . . . But we make our intermediaries all the Saints, and especially the Mother of the Lord and with her the Choir of Angels, and to that end use the Churches and the things dedicated to the Saints and prayers[1] to them and their sacred eikons which we reverence relatively and not with Divine Service[2]. . . But we enroll all the Saints as our intermediaries and ambassadors."—The same, p. 181.

"The Saints ought to be invoked for they are able to help."—The same, p. 230.

"The Saints must have a knowledge of things afar off or they would be in lesser state than we. . . . The way they have it is not by histories or letters, but by the revelation of the All-Holy Spirit . . . Who reveals what He wills to His faithful servants and awakes them to intercession[3] for those who pray and receives and fulfils their intercession. The Church, knowing this, has made a practice of old even till to-day to invoke them, but asks nothing of them except to act as ambassadors[4] towards Almighty God on behalf of us, who are surrounded with mrny afflictions and troubles of life, in order that the pitiful God may grant us patience and speedy relief. For we do not say to any Saint, 'O Saint, save or redeem or devise good things or do something for me.' In no wise—for these things are possible only to God. Nor do we term the Saints mediators.[5] For there is one mediator between God and man, the Man Jesus Christ, Who alone is able to mediate directly[6] between us and the Father.

[1] παρακλήσεσιν.
[2] σχετικῶς οὐ λατρευτικῶς προσκυνουμέναις.
[3] εἰς ἔντευξιν.
[4] πρεσβεύειν.
[5] μεσίτας.
[6] ἀμέσως.

. . . So we do not call the Saints departed mediators, but ambassadors and pleaders.[1] . . . They, acting as our ambassadors, do not use the same address as the Son in His mediation, but one very different, showing their great humility towards God. . . . They say, 'We supplicate Thy Majesty that not for our uprightness nor by our good deeds—for we have no such true righteous deeds before Thee—but for those of Thine Only begotten Son, our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, the common Saviour of us all, Thou wouldst remember our brethren on earth and deliver them from the afflictions oppressing them and make them worthy of Glory and Grace as Thou hast made us worthy. . . . Whence the Orthodox Church asks nothing of the Saints except the acting as ambassadors towards God for us and the supplicating for all things needful—not even of the Holy Theotokos herself. . . . Inasmuch as of her own power she can do nothing except act as an ambassador, we ask nothing of her except that, and to plead with her Son and her God for us . . . She indeed was included in original sin and was conceived and born as the rest of mankind. . . . But we say that she never committed actual sin."—*Kritopoulos*, p. 345.

"The Church teaches that their punishment is not material, nor in their members, nor by fire nor any other material thing, but by the pain and sorrow of conscience which come to them from the remembrance of those things which in the world they did in violation of reason and against sanctity. Therefore we pray for the departed by name for each. As often as the Lord's Supper is celebrated, no matter on what day, they are remembered in common. For all who have compiled the prayers of that Sacrament, Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, make mention of them who are fallen asleep. It is not for us to fix the time of their purification."—The same, p. 353.

[1] ἱκέτας.

"The Dead praise God for the good works and alms of the Living, and for the Prayers of the Church, made on their behalf; but chiefly for the sake of the unbloody Sacrifice[1] which the Church daily offers[2] up for the Living and the Dead; in like manner as Christ also died for both. . . . From all which it is clear, that after its separation the Soul can no more perform Penance, nor do any other work whereby it might be freed from the Chains of Hades. Therefore, only the Sacrifice, the Prayers and Alms,[3] which are performed by the Living, for their sakes, do comfort and greatly benefit the Souls, and free them from the bonds of Hades."—*Mogila*, i, 64.

"We are therefore taught by the Holy Scripture, and from the exposition of Theophylact, that we ought, by all means, to pray for the Departed, to offer the unbloody Sacrifice for them, and to dispense our Alms with a liberal hand; seeing they can no more perform these good Works[4] for themselves."—The same, i, 65.

"Moreover, it is evident that the Soul when once departed cannot again become partaker of the Sacraments of the Church. Could this be, that the Soul could satisfy there for sins committed in this life, then, by like reason, it might partake of the Sacraments of Penance there; which being contrary to Orthodox Doctrine the Church rightly and wisely offers the Unbloody Sacrifice[5] for those souls, together with her Prayers, that they may be forgiven those things wherein they had offended, whilst they continued in this life: And not that they might be delivered from any Punishment that they were then suffering for a time only. Our Church doth not admit or approve of such Fables as some men have fancied concerning the State of Souls after Death: as that they are tormented in Pits and Waters, and with sharp Prongs, when they are snatched away by Death before they can

[1] ἀναίμακτος θυσίαν.
[2] προσφέρει.
[3] Λειτουργίαι προσευχαὶ καὶ ἐλεημοσύναι.
[4] Rather "these things."
[5] προσφέρει τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν.

have done sufficient Penance for their Faults."—The same, i, 66.

"We pray unto the Saints for their Intercession[1] with God that they may sustain our Cause with Him by their Prayers[2]; but we do by no means call upon them as gods but as the Beloved of God, Whom they serve, and Whom they worship and glorify with united Hymns. And surely their Assistance[3] is very necessary for us; not, indeed, that of their own Power they can help us, but because by their Prayers[4] in our Behalf they may obtain the Grace and Favour of God for us. . . . For we do by no means worship[5] the Saints of God with that most holy Worship of Latria, but modestly call[6] upon them as our Brethren and the Friends of God, praying that they would obtain the Divine Help and Assistance for us their Brethren, and be as Mediators[7] with God for us."—The same, iii, 52.

"But we say that the Saints are intercessors[8] to bring our prayers and petitions to Him; and chiefly the Immaculate Mother of the Divine Word, and likewise the Holy Angels; whom we know to be set over us as guards to defend us. . . . But we believe the Saints not only while they are upon earth are our orators and mediators[9] with God, but chiefly after their death; when . . . they clearly behold the Holy Trinity, in Whose infinite light they see what is done by us. For as we doubt not but the prophets, while they were in the mortal body, knew the things that were done in Heaven, and by that means foretold future events, so we do not only doubt but firmly believe and confess that the angels, and the saints who are equal with the angels, see what belongs to us in the infinite light of God."—*Dositheus*, viii, p. 146.

[1] μεσιτείαν.
[2] παράκλοῦσι.
[3] βοήθειαν.
[4] πρεσβείαις.
[5] τιμῶμεν λατρευτικῶς.
[6] ἐπικαλούμεθα.
[7] μεσιτεύουσιν.
[8] πρεσβευτάς.
[9] μεσίτας καὶ πρεσβευτάς.

"We believe the souls of the deceased are either in rest or in torment"[1] . . . to help them "nothing contributes more than the Unbloody Sacrifice,[2] which each person particularly offers[3] for his relations, and which the Catholic Church daily offers for all."—The same, p. 160.

"But we honour[4] the saints upon two accounts. First, as they bear a relation to God, we worship them for His sake; and for their own, as they are the living images of God. . . . Thus we worship[5] the saints in the manner we have said, and the holy images which we place in our temples for ornament, and that they may be instead of books to the ignorant whereby they may be incited to remember and imitate the saints, and increase in love, and continually call upon the Lord as Sovereign and Father of all, and upon the saints as His servants and our helpers and intercessors."[6]—The same, pp. 163, 165.

"Indeed we worship our Lady the Virgin-Mother of God with hyperdulia, but not as God; as the Mother of God,[7] but not with Latria; God forbid: that would be blasphemy. For God only do we worship with Latria and make her our intercessor with Him for sins committed after Baptism, and by her hope for remission from Him . . . . . For the worship we give them is that of Dulia, as servants elect of God, and honoured by Him."—*Patriarchs' Answer to Nonjurors*, 1718, pp. 52, 53.

"The faithful who belong to the Church militant on earth, in offering their prayers to God, call at the same time to their aid the Saints who belong to the Church in Heaven; and these, standing on the highest steps of the approach to God, by their prayers and intercessions purify, strengthen, and offer before God the prayers of the faithful living upon earth, and by the will of God work

[1] δδύνη.
[2] τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας.
[3] ποιεῖ.
[4] τιμῶμεν.
[5] προσκυνοῦμεν.
[6] βοηθούς, μεσίτας.
[7] θεοτόκος.

graciously and beneficiently upon them, either by invisible virtue, or by distinct apparitions and in divers other ways."—*Longer Russian Catechism*, p. 78.

VIII. THE SACRAMENT OF UNCTION: EUCHELAION

"Holy Oil has also been handed down as an Holy Rite and type of the Divine Mercy, being administered[1] for their absolution and consecration to those who return. Wherefore it affords remission of sins and raises up from bodily sickness."—*Jeremiah*, p. 229.

"Euchelaion is a mystic rite administered by the Church through oil and prayer[2] over the faithful when sick. For the suffering who are anointed with such with Faith and a good hope meet with God's succour thereby. . . . Whatever sin he has committed, will be forgiven him. . . . For since the maladies which befall man do not all arise from the severity of the weather . . . but also from sins, etc."—*Kritopoulos*, p. 337.

"The Fruits of the Mystery of Holy Oil are, the Forgiveness of Sins, or the Healing[3] of the Soul, and the restoring of Health[4] unto the Body. And, however, although this latter is not always obtained, yet, nevertheless, the Forgiveness of Sins is always most assuredly thereby received."—*Mogila*, i, 119.

"The end of Euchelaion is that it may wipe out the traces and remains of sins and give health in body and soul to those who are anointed."—*Bulgaris*, p. 13.

"Unction with Oil is a Sacrament, in which, while the body is anointed with oil, God's grace is invoked on the sick, to heal him of spiritual and bodily infirmities."—*Longer Russian Catechism*, p. 97

"Unction is a Sacrament in which the priest anoints the sick with oil, and invokes upon him the Divine grace for the healing both of the body and of the soul."—*Moschake*, p. 46.

[1] χορηγούμενον. [2] δι ἐλαίου καὶ προσευχῶν. [3] σωτηρίαν. [4] ὑγείαν.

IX. HETERODOX SACRAMENTS

"If any from among the Latins return to the Orthodox and Catholic Eastern Church, they are to be anointed with Holy Chrism, but are not to be re-baptized."—*Synod of Constantinople*, 1484.

"But in this Canon Fifteen of the Sixth Œcumenical Council we read: 'Them that are converted from heretics we receive thus: Arians, Macedonians, etc., Nestorians, Quartodecimans, Appollinarists, and Eutychians and Sabellians, and those who come from similar heresies, on their anathematizing all heresies, and their own among the rest, we anoint with Holy Chrism on the breast, the eyes, the nostrils, the lips, and the ears, singing them and saying 'The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Ghost.' And with this Canon the answer given to the Metropolitan of Kroutiz in the Synodal Exposition does *not* agree. . . . And now we have all judged unanimously that it is not right to re-baptize Latins; but that after having anathematized their heresies and confessed their sins they ought to be anointed with holy Chrism, and so be admitted to the divine Mysteries, and to the Communion of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, according to the sacred Canons of which mention has been made more at length above."—*Moscow Synod*, 1667, *Palmer's Dissertations*, pp. 189, 196.

"The Church receives those who, abjuring their heresy, embrace the Catholic Faith, although they received their baptism with great weakness of Faith; and does not again baptize them when they come to perfection in the Faith."[1]—*Dositheus*, xv, p. 155.

"You put a question concerning Lutherans and Calvinists. . . . This same question was proposed in time

[1] οἱγὰρ αἱρετικοὶ, οὓς τήν αἵρεσιν ἀποσεισαμένους καὶ προστεθέντας τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, δέχεται ἡ ἐκκλησία. καίτοι ἐλλιπῆ ἐσχηκότες τὴν πίστιν τέλειον ἔλαβον τὸ βάπτισμα. ὅθεν τελείαν ὕστερον τὴν πίστιν κεκτημένοι οὐκ ἀναβαπτίζονται.

past by certain other persons also of blessed memory to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyprian.[1] And when the matter had been carefully considered and examined into by a Sacred Synod, it was decreed, in conformity with the Holy Canons (which I consider it superfluous to write out here at length or to enumerate by their titles), that they ought to be perfected by unction only with the Holy Chrism, and by no means to be re-baptized, when they come voluntarily to the light of the Orthodox Service, after they have first abjured their strange paternal traditions and unseemly opinion and have confessed sincerely all that in spiritual matters is taught and preached by the Catholic Apostolic and Eastern Church."—*The Œcumenical Patriarch, Jeremiah II's Letter to Peter the Great*, 1718; *Palmer's Dissertations*, p. 198.

"There are some ignorant men among the clergy who would re-baptize Romans, as well as Lutherans and Calvinists, when they come over to the Eastern Church; while the schismatics among ourselves are not ashamed even to re-baptize those of our own people who fall away from the Church, in order to go over to their errors. But the Seventh Canon of the Second Œcumenical Council sufficiently refutes both the ignorance of the first and the blindness of the last: for that Holy Council, in the Canon cited, forbids to re-baptize not only such as the Romans, Lutherans, and Calvinists (who all clearly confess the Holy Trinity and admit the work of our salvation accomplished by the Incarnation of the Son of God), but even the Arians themselves."—*Duty of Parish Priests* (*Russian*), *Komissky, Archbishop of Mogileff*, 1717–95, *approved by the Holy Synod and used throughout Russia*, trans. by Blackmore, p. 209.

". . . and following the Canons of the Holy Apostles and the Divine Fathers and knowing only one, our own,

[1] 1708–9, 1713–4.

Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, acknowledge only her Sacraments, and consequently also her divine Baptism; but as for those of the heretics, which are not administered as the Holy Ghost commanded the Holy Apostles, and as the Church of Christ has ever administered them, and administers them at this present day, but are inventions of corrupt men, we judging them to be monstrous and alien to the whole tradition of the Apostles, do reject them by common determination; and such as come over to us from them we receive as unordained and unbaptized. . . ."—*Constantinople Oros of* 1756, *Palmer's Dissertations*, p. 200.

"The sufficiency in general and in essence of the Form of the Sacrament of Baptism in the C.P.B. is assumed by the fact that the validity of Anglican Baptism is acknowledged by the Orthodox Russian Church."—*Observations of the Russian Holy Synod upon the American Prayer Book*, 1904, Barnes & Frere, p. 21.

"We believe in the sincerity of their Faith in the All-Holy and Life originative Trinity, and on that account we accept (as valid) the baptism of both one and the other. We respect the Apostolic Succession of the Latin hierarchy, and those of the clergy who join our Church we accept (as validly ordained) in the Orders which they then possess, just as we do in the case of Armenians, Copts, Nestorians, and other bodies that have not lost the Apostolic Succession."—*Russian Epistle*, p. 14.

"Various reasons do not permit the Eastern-Orthodox Church to accept, without being on her guard,[1] the validity of the Baptism of Anglicans, though performed at times with trine[2] elevations and immersions. The same reasons also hold good in relation to the Orders of the same Church. . . . If at times certain concessions[3] have been made in these two matters by the Orthodox

[1] ἀνεπιφυλάκτως. [2] *true* is a misprint. [3] ὶκονομίαι.

Church to the Anglican under certain circumstances, this is very different from the definitive acceptance of the Baptism and Orders of the Anglicans. Our Church, moved by a higher Spirit, has sometimes made and still makes use of certain concessions; only she has the profoundest sentiment of rigid[1] Orthodoxy, and of that which is befitting to preserve this deposit unimpaired. . . . Questions of this kind will only then be dealt with successfully . . . when the proposal of them is made by the entire Anglican Church to the entire Eastern-Orthodox Church; and when they are put forward for examination not alone and by themselves, but together with all the remaining ones. It is impossible while there is no previous unity and Communion[2] existing between the churches, that such serious questions should be examined and solved independently."—*Declaration of Damianos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to Bishop Blyth*, 1908. *Eirene* i, p. 14.

[1] αὐστηρᾶς. [2] δογματικῆς καὶ μυστηριακῆς ἑνότητος.

APPENDIX II

THE ŒCUMENICAL CHURCH AND THE AUTOCEPHALOUS CHURCHES

APPENDIX II

THE ŒCUMENICAL CHURCH AND THE AUTOCEPHALOUS CHURCHES

AS is abundantly evidenced in the passages collected in Section I, The Church, etc., Appendix I, the Eastern-Orthodox know only one Church which is incapable of division and which to-day is confined to their own.

That Church is the Œcumenical Church,[1] i.e. it is organized throughout the world as an unity, with one Life of Faith and in the Communion of the same Sacraments.

In its government it is episcopal, the totality of episcopal jurisdiction making up the whole unity. By its developed polity, which is not of divine institution but of ecclesiastical, the individual bishops, whose jurisdiction in their dioceses originally was and would otherwise be subject alone to Christ, are grouped into local Churches, each of which is presided over by a chief bishop, styled Patriarch, Metropolitan, Archbishop, etc.

As things are now, while each of these Churches is an integral part of the whole Church, it is inseparable from it and must perish if cut off from the others,[2] and is *autocephalous*, i.e. it admits no outside jurisdiction, has its own chief bishop for its head under Christ, and

[1] From *Οἰκουμένη*, the civilized or organized world, a term originally descriptive of the Roman Empire, and afterwards extended to the Church in all lands.

[2] See Appendix I, pp. 130–2.

admits no superior authority other than an Œcumenical Council, the decrees of which are, of course, binding on it and its sister Churches.

The autocephalicity of a local Church and its relative precedence as well as the rights of particular sees, Apostolic or otherwise, their jurisdiction and their existence are matters of ecclesiastical arrangement, and as such are held both to have originated in and to be capable of change by the action of the Œcumenical Church, i.e. the totality of the particular Churches, which action can take place either by general consent or by the specific decree of an Œcumenical Council.

It was thus that in the Fifth Century the Œcumenical Church organized herself into the five Patriarchates of Old Rome, New Rome (Constantinople), Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem.

Other Churches, e.g. the ancient British Church[1] and the Church of Cyprus, however, claimed the right of independence of external jurisdiction.

When Rome drew the West into schism in 1054, the Patriarchates were reduced automatically to the number of four.

In 1589 the four Patriarchates recognized the Church of Russia, which from its foundation in 987 had been in the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, as autocephalous and the Metropolitan of Moscow as its Patriarch, the number of the Patriarchates thus being restored to five.

The fact that after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, with the exception of Russia and a fringe of the Hapsburg dominions, the whole Eastern-Orthodox World remained for three centuries within the dominion of the Sultans had important reactions.

1. The Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople became the civil head of the Eastern-Orthodox in

[1] This is not to be read here as my contention, but is the view of the Eastern-Orthodox. See Appendix I, p. 129.

Turkey and therefore, though not in his spiritual function as their ecclesiastical chief, held his office as such by the Sultan's berat.

2. The Serb, Bulgar and other Balkan Churches, which had claimed to be autocephalous, and whose chief bishops had been dignified by the style of Patriarch, were merged in his jurisdiction.[1]
3. The Eastern-Orthodox in the Hapsburg Dominions being largely refugees from Serbia and Rumania and being always politically at war with the Sultan as Khalif of Islam, could not be under the Œcumenical Patriarch's rule both for their own sake, and for his. They, therefore, formed autocephalous Churches.
4. The Sultans were naturally suspicious of intercourse between their *rayah*[2] and the Eastern-Orthodox in Russia and in Austria-Hungary. Consequently official communications between the Œcumenical Patriarchs and the Eastern-Orthodox Churches outside Turkey were minimized.
5. In the Nineteenth Century it was obviously undesirable that the nationalities which won their freedom from the Turkish tyranny, should continue under the Œcumenical Patriarch's jurisdiction. It was also desirable that the new national States should be able to work their own future without the risk of complications of international politics in the ecclesiastical sphere similar to those with which we are familiar in the West.

For these and the like reasons it has obtained that, as the Eastern-Orthodox nationalities of the Balkans have been constituted separate and independent States,

[1] The Serb and Bulgar Patriarchs were so styled because their sovereigns assumed the title of Cæsar. Their own title was at most grudgingly admitted by the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

[2] There is no need here to describe the Turkish *millet* system by which the *rayah* or Christian subjects of the Sultan are classified according to their ecclesiastical denomination and have their own internal laws. See my *Redemption of St. Sophia*, chapter iv.

particular autocephalous Churches have also correspondingly been constituted in each of these States.[1]

These Churches may rightly be termed "national," but only in the limited modern sense. Thus the Jugo-Slav Church which, as we should say, is established in Jugo-Slavia, cannot exercise jurisdiction over Jugo-Slavs in other Eastern-Orthodox lands without the consent of the local autocephalous Church.

It was, indeed, the invasion by the Church of Bulgaria of the boundaries of the Great Church of Constantinople in the 'seventies, and the setting up of bishoprics in Thrace without its consent, which brought the former into schism with the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the claim to have the right to appoint bishops outside its proper territorial boundaries being stigmatized as Phyletism, i.e. Nationalism. It is, however, necessary that on account of language and so forth provision should be made by autocephalous churches for the care of those of their people who reside abroad. This, however, is and can only be done in Orthodox lands by *economies* and with the consent of the local authorities. In non-Orthodox lands such as Western Europe, America, and so forth, the Eastern-Orthodox are generally grouped into congregations which are dependent on one of the autocephalous Churches and are subject to its Holy Synod. Thus, while in London the Greek Community is dependent on Athens and the Russian on Russia, there are Ruman congregations in Serbia with Ruman bishops. It should be remembered, however, that these arrangements are always provisional and that the membership of the individual Eastern-Orthodox in the Œcumenical Church altogether transcends his membership in a particular autocephalous Church.

Further, while it is true that certain divergencies of

[1] A parallel would be the setting up of the Welsh Church as independent of Canterbury in 1920.

practice[1] may be noted among the autocephalous Churches, there is an uniformity of belief and practice which is at first sight all the more amazing because it is enforced by no central authority and because until recent years there has been very little communication between the particular Churches. This uniformity is due to the principle of Œcumenicity which makes each particular Church altogether unwilling to be differentiated from the rest[2] and to the brotherly spirit of equality which forbids any claim to overlordship of one particular Church over another. The former is admirably expounded in the Constantinople and Russian letters of 1895 and 1903. The latter was set forth by Theophilus, Metropolitan of Athens, writing to an Anglican[3] in words which cannot be improved, "Never seeking any worldly advantages, pursuing no devious or hidden political or national aim, leaning upon no earthly support, but being the pure, spiritual fellowship of the faithful, wherever they may be, the Eastern-Orthodox Church is neither Greek nor Russian nor Græco-Russ, nor Russo-Greek . . . but One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church binding together and at the same time raising up, all nations and all peoples into a spiritual unity above all distinctions of race. In this consists the unity of the Eastern Church; manifold in its members, it is one in its cohesive force and life-giving spirit. Unity then and union with the Orthodox Church is not a fusion or taking away of the national and ethical diversity in-wrought by God; it is not a slavish subjection of some to others; it is not a despotic raising up or a tyrannical levelling of national peculiarities and differences; but a certain brotherly harmonious binding together of spirit manifested

[1] Between the Russian and Greeks, as to the shape of vestments, the dress of the clergy, the use of prayer-oil, and so forth. In Serbia baptism is often administered by affusion, etc.

[2] See Appendix III, p. 178.

[3] The Rev. Charles Hale in 1872, see *E.C.A. Paper*, No. ix, page 21.

through a common creed voluntarily accepted, of the fundamentals of the Faith, which the Divine Scriptures, the Apostolic Tradition and the Œcumenical Councils of the Undivided Church have defined for us. Those who are in all places thus bound together, realize "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Orthodox Church."[1]

The Eastern-Orthodox Church thus to-day consists of a congeries and sodality of churches which, except in jurisdiction, it would be wrong to describe as independent of or in any way divided from each other, but which are rightly described as autocephalous.

The Great War and its changes in the map have called for some re-grouping, and, as always, the flexible nature of Eastern-Orthodox polity has happily been able to meet the need.

The fact that this little book is written during the period of waiting for the ratification of the Treaty of Sèvres, makes the following enumeration of the autocephalous Churches almost certain to require revision in the near future.

(i) *The Œcumenical Patriarchate or the Great Church of Constantinople.* At the Council of Chalcedon (451) the Patriarch of Constantinople, i.e. New Rome, received the second place among the five Patriarchs, Rome protesting but subsequently acknowledging the change. Between 590 and 595, the title of Œcumenical Patriarch was accorded to John the Faster, Rome at that time being of little importance in the Empire, the Emperor residing at Constantinople and the Patriarch being entrusted with certain administrative functions throughout the Œcumenical Empire.[2]

After the lapse of Rome, the Œcumenical Patriarch was left the acknowledged chief bishop of the Orthodox

[1] See also Appendix I, § 1, passim.

[2] The theory of the Roman Empire after Constantine was, of course, the bilateral nature of Church and State both being Œcumenical and the Empire being the civil aspect of the Church. The Emperor was thus the symbol of both.

Church and the Œcumenical Patriarchate "the centre of Orthodoxy."[1]

At one time or other Russia and all the Balkans were included in the Patriarchate, but the coming into being of the modern autocephalous Churches has reduced its territory to small dimensions. It is now uncertain whether Thrace and the other parts of Redeemed Greece which will be annexed to the Kingdom, will remain in the Patriarchate. Modern custom would point to their being transferred to the Church of the State to which their territory will belong politically. If and when, however, the Greek idea is realized and Constantinople itself is liberated, then undoubtedly the Church of Greece will be merged in the Patriarchate.

It is the eternal glory of the Patriarchate that it has invariably acquiesced in the setting up of autocephalous churches such as those of Russia, Rumania, Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria at its own territorial expense. The controversialist's suggestion that it has been opposed to Slav independence is unfair and unjustifiable.[2]

In view of the close interconnection between the sphere of religion and politics in the Near East and of its relation to the Sultan, the Patriarchate might easily have become an instrument of Turkish policy for the repression of the Nineteenth Century nationalist movements in the Balkans.

That it was not tempted to form an alliance of that kind for the maintenance of its own power or the increase of its own importance is due to its clear grasp of the fundamental principles of Orthodox polity which admit of no prescriptive quasi-feudal rights of overlordship. The Patriarchate has never had the least inclination to become a Papacy. In consequence, as

[1] *τὸ κέντρον τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας.* See Appendix I, p. 141.
[2] Dr. Fortescue's *The Orthodox Eastern Church* is redolent of such misrepresentations.

far as Orthodoxy can have a centre, the Œcumenical Patriarchate is to-day the natural centre of the Orthodox World and, though not dogmatically necessary, Communion with it is regarded as a test of Orthodoxy.[1]

The symbol of the Œcumenical Patriarchate's primacy is that the consecration of the Holy Chrism,[2] for all the autocephalous Churches, originally the function of each bishop, is now concentrated in him or in the chief bishop of particular Churches, e.g. the Russian and Ruman, to whom he has conceded it.

This function is his prescriptively by general consent. His possession of it does not belong to the dogmatic realm.

As in all the autocephalous Churches, his government is constitutional, the Holy Synod of the Great Church assisting him.

(ii) *The Patriarchate of Alexandria.*

(iii) *The Patriarchate of Antioch.*

(iv) *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem.*

(v) *The Church of Cyprus.*

(vi) *The Patriarchate of Russia*, autocephalous since 1589, the Metropolitan of Moscow being reckoned the fifth Patriarch since 1591. The suspension of the Patriarchate by Peter I in 1721 was ended in 1917.[3]

(vii) *The Church of Georgia*, which, after the annexation of the country by Russia in 1802, was merged in the Russian Church, declared itself autocephalous in 1919. This action, however, now awaits full acceptance, which during the disturbed state of Russia is impossible for canonical reasons.

(viii) *The Church of Jugo-Slavia* into which the four Churches of Carlowicz, Czernagora (Montenegro),

[1] It is, of course, conceivable that it should fall into heresy.

[2] Compounded of oil, balsam and many unguents, and consecrated by the Patriarch with his Holy Synod on Maundy Thursday, about every ten years, e.g. in 1902 and 1912.

[3] See an account in the Anglo-Foreign Church Society's Report, 1920.

Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina merged themselves in 1919, Dimitri, Metropolitan of Belgrad, being elected the first Patriarch on November 12th, 1920. The Church of Carlowicz was formed in 1765 on an influx of immigrants into Austro-Hungary from Old Serbia under the Patriarch of Ipek, the successor of the Patriarch of the mediæval Serb Empire.[1] The Church of Czernagora, formerly in the jurisdiction of Ipek, had been recognized as autocephalous in 1765 and that of Bosnia in 1880.

(ix) *The Church of the Kingdom of Greece* declared itself autocephalous in 1833 and was so reckoned in 1850. It is distinct from the Œcumenical Patriarchate for the reasons stated above.

(x) *The Church of Rumania*, reckoned autocephalous since 1885, into which the autocephalous Churches of Hermannstadt (the Rumans of Hungary) and that of Czernowicz (the Ruthenians) have been merged.

(xi) *The Church of Sinai*, i.e. of the monasteries in that "holy place," the abbot of St. Catherine's being titular bishop of Pharan in Egypt and Archbishop of Sinai. This Church is reckoned autocephalous, although its Archbishop is consecrated by the Patriarch of Jerusalem.[2]

(xii) *The Church of Bulgaria*, reckoned autocephalous in 1870, is now in schism with the Œcumenical Patriarchate and is, therefore, not included in the list.

(xiii) *The Church of Ukrainia*, which is in the same state as that of Georgia.

[1] In 1220 St. Saba, the national saint of Serbia, won back the Serbs who had turned to Rome, and with the Œcumenical Patriarch's consent established the Serb Church as autocephalous under the archbishops of Ipek. When Stephan Dushan declared himself a Cæsar, Ipek was in consequence and correspondingly declared a Patriarchate in 1346.

[2] It is held a mark of autocephalicity that the chief bishop of an autocephalous church should be enthronized or consecrated only by one of its bishops.

APPENDIX III

EASTERN-ORTHODOX ECONOMY IN REGARD TO HETERODOX SACRAMENTS

APPENDIX III

EASTERN-ORTHODOX ECONOMY IN REGARD TO HETERODOX SACRAMENTS.

EASTERN-ORTHODOX theologians agree that the One True Church cannot in strictness recognize the existence of Sacraments outside herself but that by economy the Church can accept heterodox Sacraments as valid, not in principle and *per se*, but in such particular cases and for such particular reasons as in her judgment may be sufficient.

Theoretically her discretion as to such acceptance is complete, and by it she could re-invalidate sacraments which were deficient in rite and even in purpose. For example, she could accept Baptism by a Quaker or Orders conferred by a Presbyterian.

Thus if Latin Baptism by affusion be held invalid[1] not only because heterodox but also as deficient in its outward part, Latins can none the less be received in their Baptism and when in emergency could be admitted to Communion.

On the other hand there are abundant precedents dating from the age of the Fathers which in effect debar such acceptance being accorded to Baptism that is not in the Name of the Trinity and otherwise analogous to Eastern-Orthodox Baptism. There is also no precedent whatever for such acceptance of heterodox ministers in Orders which have been conferred without the Apostolic Succession, the laying on of hands and the purpose to make a priest in the Eastern-Orthodox sense.

[1] As e.g. the Protosyncellos maintained at Florence, *Sgyropoulos*, § 9, chap. vi.

The principle of Œcumenicity, of course, makes it desirable and almost, if not altogether, necessary that any such acceptance of heterodox Sacraments should be communicated to his own particular Church by the hierarch according it, and also by the Church according or permitting it to the other autocephalous Churches, and especially to the Œcumenical Patriarchate. Such intercommunication would, of course, prevent inconsistency or difference of opinion as to the general advisability of the rejection or acceptance of the Sacraments of any particular heterodox body.

Such communication, however, appears not to be imperative and has until recently not taken place frequently.

Until the Seventeenth Century the Eastern-Orthodox Churches accepted Western Baptism *economically*, the procedure being that according to decrees of Synods held at Constantinople in 1261 and 1481 converts were chrismated.[1] It could thus be said that in the Middle Ages there was a *rule* which, if not binding the discretion of all the autocephalous churches, at least served as a standard for the whole Eastern-Orthodox Communion. The hierarchs of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches had decided that in view of the general Faith and the Baptismal rite of the West, it would be right and proper to facilitate the healing of the schism as a whole and the return to Orthodoxy of individuals by accepting Western Baptism.

The first breach in this uniformity of prescription occurred in 1629 when, under the presidency of the Patriarch Nicon, a Synod of the Russian Church laid it down that, on adhering to Orthodoxy, all Westerns, both Papalists and Protestants, should be rebaptized.[2]

[1] i.e. receiving the symbol of the ancient rite of reconciliation rather than the second Sacrament.

[2] None the less between the time of Cerularius and 1484 there were many Greek bishops who ordered the repetition of Western baptism on the ground that Baptism by Affusion is not baptism, cf. Palmer, *Dissertations*, p. 108.

This was not inconsistent with the fact that the other autocephalous Churches, i.e. for practical purposes at that time the four Greek Patriarchates, continued simply to chrismate their Western converts. In Russia itself, however, there was a strong opinion that the decision was a mistake, and its justification was challenged, not of course as to the abstract right of the Russian Church to adopt its new rule, but as to the charity and wisdom of its *economy*. Thus, in order to remove the obstacle of the necessity of the repudiation of his past ministry by a converted Papalist priest, Peter Mogila prepared an office of conditional reordination.[1]

The Russian Church, however, did not maintain its decision long, and in the Synod of Moscow, 1666-7, ordered a reversion to the older usage.[2]

Since then the Russian Church has not only received Papalists without rebaptism and in their Orders, but has also on occasion dispensed with their chrismation. Thus, when practically the whole body of Russian Uniates renounced the Papacy in the second decade of last century, some 2,000,000 were reconciled in large bodies on their reciting the Creed without *filioque* and abjuring their former heresies.[3]

Further in 1718, with the assent of the Œcumenical Patriarch Jeremiah III, the Russian Church prescribed the acceptance of Lutheran and Calvinist Baptism.

In consequence, however, of Papalist proselytization,[4] and in spite of other considerations, a Constitution[5] of the four Greek Patriarchs decided in 1756 that, Baptism by Affusion not being in Orthodox teaching true Baptism

[1] See also the form of conditional Baptism in Blackmore, p. 211.

[2] Palmer prints from the Travels of Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch in Russia, 1654-6, an account of the reception of some Papalist priests, *Dissertations*, p. 186.

[3] *Newman*, pp. 120, 165, etc.

[4] Athanasius Parius, a contemporary, writes, "Now the season of *Economy* has passed," ed. Notaras, Leipzig, 1806, p. 350.

[5] ὅρος. This has been much challenged.

they would no longer accept Western Baptism. This decision meant, of course, the withdrawal by *Economy* of what had been allowed *economically*, and, after the fashion of the Russian action of 1629, is capable of reversal. Any one of the Churches which decided upon it or any one of the Churches which formed part of the four Patriarchs' jurisdiction in 1756 could withdraw from it. The assent of the others to such a step would indeed be a condition with which under the principle of Œcumenicity they would be unwilling to dispense. But the treatment of heterodox sacraments is a matter of *Economy*, similarity in the exercise of which is often undesirable through diversity of local necessities and conditions.[1]

Although the Constitution of 1756 was not rescinded large numbers of Papalists and Protestants were accepted *economically* in their Baptism by the Greeks during the century following its promulgation.

The *economical* acceptance or rejection of the Orders of a Church by the Eastern-Orthodox has generally gone with the acceptance or rejection of its Baptism, in the case where the Church has an Episcopate with Apostolic Succession and the rite and purpose are sufficient.

Thus, while the Russians have accepted Papalist priests in their Orders since 1667, after 1756 the Greeks have rebaptized and reordained them.[2]

For instance, in 1840, Makarios, the Uniate "Metropolitan of Diarbekir" was rebaptized and reordained in

[1] Palmer, *Dissertations*, p. 109. He finds their acceptance illogical, the reason for that conclusion being his failure to grasp the fact that the acceptance of any heterodox Sacrament whatever by the Eastern-Orthodox is necessarily *economical*, and that by the nature of the case *Economy* cannot be fettered and fixed. Indeed, he never understood the principles of Orthodoxy, and from first to last seems to have tried to make them fit with Papalist theories. Ultimately he became a Roman Catholic.

[2] Thus Dr. Guetté for long the Russian chaplain in Paris, and previously a Roman Catholic priest, was received in his Orders in the 'fifties. Dr. Overbeck, also a Roman Catholic priest, whose attempt at the formation of a Western-Orthodox Church is well known, was rejected by Constantinople on the ground of his marriage after his conversion, and was told that he must be rebaptized and reordained. Subsequently he was received in his Baptism by the Russians.

all these degrees on renouncing Papalism[1] and acceding to Orthodoxy, and as late as August 29th, 1920, Dr. F. C. Kovarsh, a Roman Catholic priest, was re-ordained deacon in Prag by the Metropolitan of Nisch.

The Russian Holy Synod,[2] on the other hand, defined its custom in regard to Papalists and Protestants in 1895: "We believe in the sincerity of their Faith in the All Holy . . . . Trinity, and on that account we accept the baptism of both one and the other. We respect the Apostolical Succession of the Latin hierarchy, and those of their clergy who join our Church we accept in the Orders which they then possess, just as we do in the case of Armenians, Copts, Nestorians[3] and other bodies that have not lost the Apostolic Succession."[4]

In regard to the giving and receiving of the Blessed Sacrament in emergency mediæval precedents may be found on both sides. Thus Western captives in Alexandria[5] were admitted to Communion in the Fourteenth Century by the Greek clergy.

In addition to those cited,[6] instances of *economical*

[1] Dr. A. Fortescue, who has endeavoured to make propagandist capital for Papalism out of the Eastern-Orthodox reordination of Anglican priests, writes in his most unattractive vein, "Anglicans need not feel hurt at this sort of thing (sc. such reordinations); the Orthodox have reordained Latin priests and bishops too," *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 262. Anglicans are not in the least hurt. While they are pained at being driven unwittingly to explain the amazing condemnation of Anglican Orders by Leo XIII as an instance of the subordination of knowledge to expediency, they understand the Eastern-Orthodox attitude, and, while they think it only awaits information to be changed, approve it.

[2] Russian Letter, p. 14.

[3] In modern times the Baptism, Chrismatism, and Orders of the Armenians, Copts, West Syrians and Nestorians have been accepted consistently by all the Eastern-Orthodox. *Economical* conjoint prayer and communion with them on the part of the Eastern-Orthodox both in emergency and on ceremonial occasions have been frequent.

[4] See chapters i and ii.

[5] See Demetrius of Bulgaria's opinion, 1203, in *Palmer's Dissertations*, p. 31. So far as I know, no synodical enactment has dealt with the acceptance of their Sacraments.

[6] Bishop Gaul describes how, being told at Salisbury, South Africa, by a Greek, "The Bishop of Constantinople told us to go to the English Church for Sacraments," he invited the Greeks in that town to come to the Eucharist. On their coming he wrote to the Œcumenical Patriarch, who, in reply, thanked him. A Greek priest came and stayed awhile, being present daily in the Sanctuary. Since then the Greeks "are ministered to as a matter of course." *Eirene* 1910, i, 4, p. 12. For a similar *praxis* see the same i, 4, p. 28, i, 6, p. 14, Lady Day 1914, p. 11.

Communion at Anglican Altars by the Eastern-Orthodox have been too many in the past fifteen years for enumeration.

These, however, may be added here :

As far back as February 14, 1863, Father Denton, vicar of St. Bartholomew's Cripplegate, was admitted to Communion in Serbia with the consent of the Holy Synod and the Metropolitan.[1]

From before 1903, the Greeks in Mashonaland[2] have resorted to Anglican Altars especially at a midnight Mass on Easter Eve in the Cathedral, both Species being administered to them by intinction.

In Pretoria in 1911 the Archimandrite received the Blessed Sacrament. Another Archimandrite made a practice of doing so.

In 1908 Bishop Rowe and the Russian Bishop Innocent made an agreement whereby their respective priests should minister to their respective people when isolated, one of them always remaining in Sitka during the absence of the other.

In 1910 Bishop Raphael of the Syrian Eastern-Orthodox issued a letter[3] authorizing the Baptism[4] of the children of Eastern-Orthodox and the Communion of the Eastern-Orthodox in emergency by Anglican priests. This he afterwards revoked, but the Communion of the Eastern-Orthodox at Anglican Altars in Jamaica has continued.

In February, 1917, Bishop Alexander of Rhodostolon with his chaplain received the Blessed Sacrament at Baltimore.

In October, 1919, Bishop Israel was asked with Father

[1] Cp. *Church Times*, August 22, 1919. The event was hailed by Neale's "Good News from Serbia." Efforts were made to induce the Serbs to reconsider the *economy*, but it was repeated.

[2] See account in A.E.-O. C.U. Report, 1908.

[3] Printed in *Eirene* i, 6, p. 26 (1911).

[4] *Eirene* i, p. 38, records that Eastern-Orthodox immigrants in U.S.A. instinctively turn to our Church for sympathy and come to our priests for baptism and marriage. Conversely the Baptism of Anglican children by the Eastern-Orthodox has been frequent, e.g. see *E.C.A. Paper* VIII, p. 14.

Emhardt to take part in the Liturgy as co-consecrators with the priest Samorisky in Detroit, and did so.

In 1912 the priest Hanna assisted at a celebration in Cambridge, New York, and communicated.

In 1893, with the assent of Gerasimos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, Archdeacon Dowling admitted Syrian Eastern-Orthodox to Communion in Melbourne, Australia, and baptized their children.

From 1917-18 the Rev. G. D. Laffan frequently received communion and co-celebrated at Eastern-Orthodox Altars.

In the *Church Times* of August 6th, 1920, Dr. Webb, Bishop of Milwaukee, stated that he himself had "pontificated at the celebration of the Eucharist in the Greek Church at Milwaukee," and that "the Bishop of Fond du Lac had actually celebrated at the Orthodox Cathedral at Belgrade . . . with Orthodox clergy and bishops present."

Finally, it should be noted that the Delegation of the Holy Synod of Constantinople to the Lambeth Conference in 1920 authorized the publication of a statement that "the authorities of the Great Church would not allow the administration of the Sacrament of Orders to an Anglican priest who left a Church of the Anglican Communion and desired to be received into the Eastern-Orthodox Church within the jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarchate."

APPENDIX IV

LIST OF BOOKS, PERIODICALS AND REPORTS.

I. English, French and German.

II. Greek.

LIST OF BOOKS

A complete list of books for the study of the problem of Reunion with the Eastern-Orthodox would be almost identical with a Bibliography of Orthodoxy and would necessarily be impossible here. I append, however, a list of books to which the ordinary reader can probably obtain access without difficulty, and have marked with an asterisk a few of those which readers unacquainted with the Eastern-Orthodox Church will find it most profitable to read.

It will be noted that while there are several English and French books dealing with Russian Theology there are very few dealing with Greek.

Of the former I should especially commend attention to the writings of Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, which in themselves are an admirable introduction to the study of Eastern-Orthodoxy and are indispensable.

Dr. Adrian Fortescue's *Orthodox Eastern Church*, which, as the only compendious survey in English, is much quoted, must be read with the greatest discrimination, since it is altogether an unsafe guide to Eastern-Orthodox Theology, of which it obscures the principles strangely and completely. In many ways it appears to have been written with a special eye on Anglo-Catholics for controversial and propagandist purposes. Thus for example in summarizing the points of difference between the Eastern-Orthodox and Papalists, Dr. Fortescue tells us (p. 630) that, "Both sides in this quarrel recognize that the real issue is one of schism rather than of heresy." Seemingly no opportunity is lost by

him of making the attitude of the Eastern-Orthodox towards Anglican Orders appear unfavourable.

Palmieri's monumental work of which the first two volumes have appeared in Latin is, of course, exhaustive, and though Papalist, of a different category.

I. English, French and German.

*Androutsos (C.) The Validity of English Ordinations. Trans. by Groves Campbell. 1909, Grant Richards.
This book is referred to frequently in this monograph and is of capital importance.

Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches Union. Reports of 1906–14. Berryman, London.

Anglo-Foreign Church Society, Reports of. Church House, S.W.

Barnes (W. J.) and Frere (W. H.) Russian Observations upon the American Prayer Book. Mowbray's, 1917.
A set of somewhat stiff comments. The footnotes by Frere are valuable.

*Bernardakis (D. N.) A Catechism. Trans. by Cobham, 1903. Cyprus. See Appendix I.

*Birkbeck (W. J.) Russia and the English Church, containing a correspondence between Mr. William Palmer and M. Khomiakoff in the years 1844–1854. S.P.C.K., 1917, London.
Of capital importance, but must be read as representing only the modern Russian point of view.

*Blackmore (R. W.) The Doctrine of the Russian Church, 1845. Brown, Aberdeen.
A translation of the Russian Primer, of Philaret's Longer Catechism, and of the (Russian) Duty of Parish Priests. With valuable introduction. Should be read by all students.

Bromage (L. G.) Mother of all the Churches, being a faithful translation of one of the popular Catechisms of the Holy Orthodox Church. London, 1891.

*Bulgakoff (A.) The Question of Anglican Orders. Trans. by W. J. Birkbeck. 1899, S.P.C.K.
Of capital importance.

Burnie (R. W.) Intercommunion with the Eastern-Orthodox Church. 1915, S.P.C.K.

CALLINICOS (C.) The Greek Orthodox Church. 1918, Longman, Green.
A short account of its polity and practice for Anglicans by the learned Archpriest of Manchester, who served on the Constantinople Delegation to the Lambeth Conference, 1920.

CALVET (J.) L'Abbé Gustav Morel. Trans. by Dredge. 1913, G. Allen.
Contains references to Khomiakoff and the Old Catholics.

CHRISTIAN EAST. The magazine of the Anglican and Eastern Association, first published under the editorship of Dr. Sparrow Simpson in 1920; deals also with other Eastern Churches.

COBHAM (C. D.) Patriarchs of Constantinople. 1911, Cambridge University Press.

CONVOCATION. Reports on Intercommunion with the Eastern-Orthodox Church, 1865–1876, three series. 1904, Parker, Oxford.

COVEL (J.) Some Account of the Greek Church, 1722.
Covel had resided at Constantinople and played a part in the negotiations with the Nonjurors. A valuable book.

DIEHL (C.) Byzance. 1919, Flammarion, Paris.
Should be read for its wonderful presentation of the Byzantine Church and Empire. Papalist in outlook.

DÖLLINGER (Dr.) The Pope and the Council. 1869, Rivingtons.
Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches. 1872, Oxenham.

DUCHESNE (L.) Eglises Separées. 1896, Paris.
Papalist but worth reading as different in tone to English controversialists; does not grasp the essential Eastern-Orthodox principles.

DUCKWORTH (H. T. F.) Greek Manuals of Church Doctrine. 1901, Rivingtons.

ECHOS D'ORIENT. A review begun in 1897 by the Augustinians of Constantinople; propagandist but useful.

EIRENE. The magazine of the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches Union, published between 1908 and 1914. Edited first by the Rev. W. Wakeford, afterwards by the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton.

EMHARDT (W. C.) Historical Contact of the Eastern-Orthodox and Anglican Churches, 1920, New York.
The Eastern-Orthodox Church, together with some Thoughts on Reunion. 1920, New York.
Two valuable pamphlets which should be read.

FORTESCUE (A.) The Orthodox Eastern Church. 1911, Catholic Faith Society.

A book which consciously or otherwise gravely misrepresents and maligns the Eastern-Orthodox; bears the marks of having been written in order to divert the attention of Anglicans from a *rapprochement* with them; contains much information but is frequently unreliable.

*FRERE (W. H.) Links in the Chain of Russian History. 1918, Faith Press.

A useful book.

*GOGOL (N. B.) Meditations on the Divine Liturgy. Trans. by L. Alexeieff. 1913, Mowbrays.

Explains the symbolism of the Liturgy to which it forms a valuable guide.

*GUETTÉE (C.) Dogmatical Doctrine of the Orthodox Church. Trans. by Johnston. New York.

The work of a Papalist convert to Eastern-Orthodoxy; is valuable.

HEADLAM (A. C.) Teaching of the Russian Church. Rivingtons, 1897.

Bampton Lectures. Murray, 1920.

HEFELE (C.) History of the Church Councils. Trans. by Clark. 1894, Clark, Edinburgh.

*KHOMIAKOFF (A. S.) L'Eglise Latine et le Protestantisme. 1872, Benda, Lausanne.

Quelques mots par un Chrétien Orthodoxe sur les Communions occidentales. 1855, Paris.

Cp. also Birkbeck's Russia and the English Church and Riley's Birkbeck.

Birkbeck wrote, "The works of Khomiakoff are to be found in every theological seminary in the country [Russia] and his controversial writings and those of Samarin have become the standard books of reference whenever a Russian finds it necessary to defend his national religion."—Riley's *Birkbeck*, p. 78.

KIMMEL (E. F.) Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Orientalis. 1843, Jena. Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis. 1850, Jena.

Contains the Symbolic books and other documents of Œcumenical authority.

LIDDON (H. P.) Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference at Bonn. 1876.

May be read with profit.

MACARIUS. Introduction à la Théologie Orthodoxe. 1857, Paris. Théologie dogmatique Orthodoxe. Paris.

Two books of importance; but should be read only by those who have made a study of Eastern-Orthodoxy.

MALTZEV. Die Sacramente der orthodox-katholischen Kirche des Morgenlandes. 1898, Berlin.

The author discusses Anglican Orders with caution, but not with hostility; often quoted but wrongly by Papalists as condemning them.

*Michalcescu (J.) Die Bekenntnisse und die wichtigsten Glaubens-Zeugnisse der griechisch-orientalischen Kirche. 1904, Leipsig.
Contains the Symbolic books except Kritopoulos and good introductions.

Milas (N.) Das Kirchenrecht Morgenlandischen Kirche. Berlin.

*Moschake (Ignatius) The Catechism of the Orthodox Eastern Church. S.P.C.K., 1912.
A translation of the shorter edition of 1888; authorized by the Holy Synods of Constantinople and Greece; of importance.

Mouravieff (A. N.) History of the Church of Russia. Trans. by Blackmore. 1842, Lonodon.

*Newman (Cardinal) A Visit to the Russian Church 1840–1. Palmer, 1882, Kegan, Paul & Trench.
Less valuable than Birkbeck, but should be read; not propagandist, though Papalist.

Novikoff (O.) Le Général Kireeff et l'ancien Catholicisme. Paris, 1915.
Quelques Lettres du Général Kireeff. Paris, 1917.
Reminiscences and Correspondence of. Edited by W. T. Stead. London, 1909.

*Overbeck and Robertson. The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church. 1898, Baker, Soho Square.
A translation of Mogila; valuable.

Palmer (W.) Harmony of Eastern and Anglican Doctrines. 1846, Aberdeen.
Dissertations on Subjects relating to the "Orthodox" or "Eastern Catholic" Church. 1853, Masters.
Valuable books and worth careful study, but bad guides owing to the author's preconceived notion of Eastern-Orthodoxy.

*Palmieri (A.) Theologia dogmatica orthodoxa ad lumen catholicae doctrinae examinatio. 1911–3, 2 parts. Florence.
Papalist in tone, but not propagandist; exhaustive and invaluable. In Latin and for students.

Philaret. Metropolitan of Moscow. A Comparative statement of Russo-Greek and Roman Catholic doctrines. No. 4. Russo-Greek Committee. New York, 1860.
Sermons et Discours traduits par Serpinet. 1866, Paris.
Geschichte der Kirch-Russlands, Blumenthal. 1872, Berlin.

Phillips (J. T.) The Russian Catechism. Composed and published by order of the Czar. With a short account of the Church Government, etc., the Moscovites. 1723, London.
Scarce; interesting but not of great importance.

PINKERTON (P.) A Translation of Platon's Present State of the Greek Church. Edinburgh, 1814.

PLATON, Metropolitan, the Catechism of. By G. Potessaro (from Koray's Greek version). London, 1857. See also under Pinkerton.

*PULLER (F. W.) The Continuity of the Church of England. Longmans, Green, 1912.
Contains a course of lectures delivered in Russia for the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Union; an admirable and cautious statement of our position; should be read.

RENAUDIN (P.) Luthériens et Grecs-Orthodoxes. 1903, Paris.
Useful but not of first importance.

RILEY (A.) The Seventh General Council. 1919, S.P.C.K.
Contains an account of the agreement between Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox theologians in a Jerusalem Chamber Conference, December 2nd, 1918.

*Birkbeck and the Russian Church. 1917, S.P.C.K.
There is no book of equal importance for an understanding of Eastern-Orthodoxy; perhaps ignores the Greeks too much; contains a series of essays, documents and speeches which are illuminating.

ROBINSON (N. F.) Monasticism in the Orthodox Churches. 1916, Cope & Fenwick.

*RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD, Epistle of, to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Trans. by Birkbeck. 1904, Parker, Oxford.
Of capital importance.

SALTET (C.) Dogmatical Doctrine of the Orthodox Church. Trans. by Johnston, New York.

SGUROPULUS (S.) Vera Historia Unionis non Verae. Trans. R. Creyghton. 1660.
A large account of the Council of Ferrara-Florence and the events which led up to it, by one who took part in it; the Greek is printed side by side with a free Latin translation; should be read by more advanced students.

SMITH (T.) An account of the Greek Church. 1680, London.
Useful as contemporaneous but not so valuable as Covel. The author served as chaplain in Constantinople.

SOLOVIEV (VLADIMIR) La Russie et l'Église Universelle. 1906, Paris.
Well worth reading.

SYRA AND TENOS, ARCHBISHOP OF. Report of Journey to England. With English trans. by F. I. Cartwright. London, 1871.

*VELIMIROVIC (N.) The Spiritual Rebirth of Europe. 1920, Faith Press.
Contains the first sermon preached by a non-Anglican in St. Paul's Cathedral; should be read by all students.

WILBOIS (J.) L'Avenir de l'Église russe. 1907, Paris.
Deals with Reunion; should be read with caution.

*Williams (G.) The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century. 1868, Rivingtons.
Contains the correspondence of the Nonjurors, the Confession of Dositheus in English and much valuable matter; is of capital importance.

*Wordsworth (Bishop John) The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates. 1902, Parker, Oxford.
Some Points in the Teaching of the Church of England, etc. 1900, S.P.C.K.
Should be read.

II. List of Books in Greek.

'Αναγέννησις. A magazine edited by Professor Comnenos at Constantinople.

'Ανδροῦτσος Χ. Τὸ Κῦρος τῶν 'Αγγλικῶν Χειροτονιῶν. 1903, ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.
Δογματικά, ed. 1908, ἐν Αθηναὶς

'Απόστολος Βαρναβᾶς, the official magazine of the Church of Cyprus.

"Αστυ. An Athens magazine.

Βούλγαρις, Εὐγένιος, 'Ομολογία ἤτοι πίστεως ἔκθεσις. 'Εν Αἰγινῃ, 1828.

Βούλγαρις, Νικόλαος, 'Ιερὰ Κατήχησις ἤτοι 'Εξήγησις τὴς Θείας καὶ ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, 'Ανανιάδῃ. 'Εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, 1681.
Published in 1681. B. is held in high repute among the Greeks.

Γεδέων Μ. Κανονικαί Διατάξεις. 1889, ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.

Γενναδίου, Γ, ἡ ὀρθόδοξος διδασκαλία. Αθήνῃσι, 1851.

Δαμαλᾶς, Ν. Μ. 'Ορθόδοξος Κατήχησις καὶ ἔγκρισις τῆς ἱερᾶς Συνόδου, Αθηνῃσι, 1877.

Δυοβουνίωτος, Κ. Ι. Τὰ Μύστήρια τῆς 'Ανατολικῆς 'Ορθοδόξον 'Εκκλησίας ἐξ 'Απόψεως Δογματικῆς. 1913, ἐν 'Αθηνας.

'Εκκλησιαστική 'Αλήθεια. The official journal of the Œcumenical Patriarchate. Published weekly.

'Εκκλησιαστικός Κήρυξ. The magazine of the Metropolitan of Athens.

Κνήτης, Χ. 'Ορθόδοξος Χριστιανική Κατήχησις. 1905, ἐν Σάμῳ.

Κοραῆς, Α, Σύνοψις τῆς 'Ιστορίας ἱερᾶς καὶ Κατηχήσεως. 'Εν Βενετίᾳ, 1834.

Κυρίλλου, Στηλίτευσις τοῦ Ραντισμοῦ. Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, 1756.

Printed by the Œcumenical Patriarch Cyril in 1756 with the Constitution on Papalist Baptisms. Gives a résumé of the authorities recognized by the Eastern-Orthodox on the subject.

Μεσολῶρας Συμβολικὴ τῆς Ὀρθόδοξου Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας. 1901, Ἐν Ἀθηναῖς.

Μοσχάκη, Ι. Μελεταὶ καὶ λόγοι Ἐκκλησιαστικοί. 1883, ἐν Ἀθηναῖς.

Νέα Σιών. The official magazine of the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

Νέος Ποίμην. A monthly, edited by the Head of the Theological College, Halki.

Πάριος Ἀθανασιος, Συλλογὴ τῶν θείων τῆς Πίστεως Δογμάτων. Ἐν Λειψίγᾳ, 1806.

Πηδάλιον, Τό. Ἐν Ἀθηναῖς, 1841, by the monks Agapius and Nicodemus. Contains much information in economy as applied to heterodox Sacraments. Published by order of the Holy Synod of Constantinople.

Ρώσης, Ζῆκος, Δογματικά. 1874, ἐν Ἀθηναῖς.

Φάρος. The official magazine of the Patriarch of Alexandria.

Φωτίου Ἐπιστολαί, Βάλεττα. Ἐν Λονδίνω, Nutt, 1864.

INDEX

A.

Alivisatos quoted, 36.
American Ordinal, Russian Holy Synod on, 66.
Androutsos, Prof. Chrestos, origin of his monograph, 11; scope of his investigation, 12; his conclusion as to Anglican Orders, 13; his four questions, 14, 59; on Sacraments, 53; on Economy, 56; his hesitation as to Anglican Orders, 63; his view of the position, 68; on Unbloody Sacrifice, 78; on Intercommunion, 97; on Anglican Church, 106.
Anglican Orders, Androutsos and, 13; economic acceptance, 63, 89; Bulgakoff and, 64; Sokoloff and, 65; Androutsos' requirement, 69; and Declaration, 95; not to be repeated, 183.
Antonius, Bishop, visits England, 43.
Apostolic Succession, lost by heresiarchs, 56; not necessary for economic acceptance of Orders, 60; declaration upon, 92.
Athanasius, economical action of, 57.
Athens, Holy Synod, authorises Orthodox to receive Communion at Anglican altars, 47.
Athens, Metropolitans of, *see* Meletios and Theophilus.
Autocephalicity, *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*, and Appendix II.

B.

Baptism, economical acceptance of, 59; Russian treatment of Papalist, 68; Greek ditto, 68.
Basil, St., quoted, 56 n.; economical action of, 57.
Birkbeck, W. J., work, 28; quoted, 29, 31 n., 51.
Bolshevism and Orthodoxy, 35.
Bonn Conference, disastrous effect, 16.
Bosom of Orthodoxy, The, 25.
Brisbane, Archbishop of, letter to the Archimandrite Maravelis, 45; 'hospitality,' 49.
Bulgakoff, Professor, on Anglican Orders, 64.

C.

Calvinistic Current in Anglicanism, 33.
Canterbury, Archbishop of, and Œcumenical Patriarchate, 42; at St. Sophia, Bayswater, 43 n.; receives Enkolpion, 99 n.
Carlowicz, Vicar of, in England, 44.
Catechisms quoted, 119.
Church, Eastern-Orthodox, one ark of Salvation, 34; one and only true Church, 51; different view to Papalists, 52.
Collins, Bishop, death of, 29; relations of with Eastern-Orthodox, 43; and Joachim III, 50.
Comnenos, Prof., on schismatics, 52; on Anglican relations, 109.
Conditional Baptism a futility, 54.
Confession, Androutsos' question, 14, 71; declaration upon, 92; *see* Appendix I, § 5.
Constantinople, Church of, answer to the Pope, 32; constitution, 170.
Constantinople Delegation and number of Sacraments, 71; and Unbloody Sacrifice, 80; and Declaration, 89; and our Liturgy, 94, 117; pledges itself to prevent repetition of Anglican Ordinations, 183.
Convocation, and Economy, 62; and Œcumenical Council, 86.
Cyprus, Abp. of, at St. Paul's, 43.
Cyril of Alexandria quoted, 55 n.; economical action of, 57.

D.

Damianos, Patriarch, praxis of, 99 n.
Declaration, suggested, 90.
Demotikon, Metropolitan of, at Southwark, 43.
D'Herbigny, M., mistaken statement, 50 n.
Diehl, Prof., quoted, 20.
Dimitri, Abp. of Belgrad, in England, 44.
Dogmatic Union, the only basis of Reunion, 17, 42; Bulgakoff on, 64; essential, 89; Androutsos on, 97.
Döllinger at Vienna, 79.
Dositheus on Eucharist, 74; quoted, 80; account of, 119.
Dyovouniotos, Prof., on Economy, 59; on Transubstantiation, 77.

E.

Economic Intercommunion, 17; might be increased, 96; limitations, 97; permissibility, 99; Lambeth Conference and, 100; *see* Appendix III.
Economy, definition, 55; typical cases of, 57; limitations of, 58; Dyovouniotos on, 60; Anglican instance of, 61 n.; the method forgotten in the West, 62; dictates acceptance of Anglican Orders, 69; in future, 96; instances of, Appendix III, *passim*.
Encyclical of 1848 quoted, 84, 85.
Encyclicals quoted, 119.
Episcopacy, necessity, 24; guardian of the Faith, 86.

F.

Faith, Society of, and Declaration, 89.
Filioque, an innovation, 19, 25; not the greatest difficulty, 26 and note; agreement possible, 27; Declaration upon, 92.
Florence, Council of, 20.
Fortescue, Dr. A., estimate of his book on the Eastern-Orthodox Church, 25 n.; confusion of mind, 77; and Anglican Orders, 181 n.; caution needed in reading, 187.

G.

Greek Theologians, different attitude to Russian, 66.

H.

Haddan, Arthur, quoted on Sacraments, 53.
Halki, and validity of Anglican Orders, 11.
Harrisburg, Bishop of, at Constantinople, 44.
Headlam, Prof., his basis of Union, 17–19; right as to Orthodox outlook, 35; proposal as to non-episcopal orders, 58 n.; in Intercommunion, 100; on Papacy, 101 n.
Hefele quoted, 83.
Heresiarchs, lose character of Sacraments, 54; lose Apostolic Succession, 56; to be rebaptised, etc., 57.
Heterodox Sacraments, not valid in principle, 52; to be treated at discretion, 53; how "completed," 55; accepted by Economy, 56; wholly invalid, 57; *see* Appendix I, § 9, and Appendix III.
High Church, Androutsos and, 13; declaration from, 69; and Œcumenical Councils, 86.
Home Reunion, a first care, 23; bearing of Economy on, 58.

I.

Infallibility, Œcumenical Councils, 14, 24; Eastern-Orthodox doctrine of, 81 *seq.*; of Church, 83; and Liberalism, 86; Khomiakoff's dictum, 87; v. Fallibility, 105; *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*.
Innovations, Papalist, 19, 25; *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*.
Intelligentsia in Orthodox nations, 22.
Intercommunion impossible without Dogmatic Union, 12, 30, 42.

J.

Jeremiah II's Answers referred to, 26.
Jerusalem, Synod of, why not Œcumenical Council, 84.
Joachim III and Anglican Orders, 15; statement to Bishop Collins, 50.

K.

Kemal, Mustapha, Turkification of Asia Minor by, 21.
Kholm, Bishop of, on Filioque, 26 n.

Khomiakoff on Reunion, 12; on the schism, quoted, 40; on schismatics, 51; on reconciliation, 55; on schoolmen, 77; on Transubstantiation, 77; on Encyclical of 1848, 84; and Infallibility, 87; Œcumenical Councils, 87; on Church of Prussia, 105.
Kritopoulos, Confession of, 118.

L.

Lambeth Conference, resolutions on Intercommunion, 100 n.; on Eastern Orthodox, 100 n.
Leo XIII on Anglican Orders, 13, 16.
Locum Tenens of Œcumenical Patriarchate, visit to London, and death, 42 n.; Declaration to, 90; at Lambeth Chapel, 99.
Lyons, Council of, 20.

M.

Maravelis, Archimandrite, reply to Abp. of Brisbane, 46.
Meletios, Abp. of Athens, quoted, 17; at St. Paul's, 43.
Mesoloras on Transubstantiation, 77.
Metousiosis, 72; the term, 73; Russian equivalent, 76 n.; *see* Appendix I, § 4, *passim*.
Mogila, Confession of, on Eucharist, 73; account of, 118.
Moslem Conversion, 36.
Muravieff and Palmer, 96.

N.

Nationality interchangeable with religion in Near East, 22.
Nicæa, massacre at, 21.
Nickolai, Bishop, at St. Paul's, 44.
Nonjurors on Eucharist, 72.

O.

Œcumenical Church, The, *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*, and Appendix II.
Œcumenical Councils, reference by Androutsos, 14; Faith of, 20, 22, 23; economical action of 3rd and 7th, 58; Androutsos' question, 80; Eastern-Orthodox theory of, 82; special dispensations, 83; test of, 84; Convocation and, 86; Khomiakoff's description, 87; Declaration upon, 91; *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*.
Œcumenicity, Principle of, referred to, 27; above Economy, 56; strength of, 67; defined, 67 n.; need of the West, 103; *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*, and pp. 169, 178.
Orders, economic acceptance of, 59; rejection of Papalist, 68; Declaration upon, 92; *see* Appendix I, § 6.

P.

Pagonis, Great Archimandrite, at Anglican services, 44.
Palmer, and Russia, 18; and Khomiakoff, 41, 55; and Muravieff, 96; and Rebaptism, 180 n.
Papacy, secular policy of, 11, 21; and Schism, 101.
Papalist taunts as to Anglican Orders, 16.
Patriarchs, the Four, 123.
Philaret, of Moscow, quoted, 12 n., 30; and Transubstantiation, 76; and Palmer, 96 n.
Photius, Canon of, 27.
Praxis, definition, 43 n.; two classes, 48; not subject to rule, 49.
Proselytisation, embargo on by Anglican authorities, 33; American Missions, 35; Orthodox horror of, 36.
Purpose of Sacraments, 13, 53; of Anglican Orders, 68; and Declaration, 90.
Pusey and Œcumenical Councils, 80.

Q.

Queensland, Orthodox authorised to communicate at Anglican altars, 47.

R.

Raphael, Bishop, gives and withdraws permission to receive Sacraments, 50 n.
Real Presence, Androutsos' question, 14, 24, 71; no definition by Œcumenical Council, 72; Declaration upon, 92; *see* Appendix I, § 4, *passim*.
Reconciliation reinvalidates Sacraments, 55; how effected, 57.
Reformation, none in Orthodox history, 34.
Rhodostolos, Bishop of, communicates at American altar, 45.
Rhossis and Döllinger, 79.
Roman Methods of Deduction, inapplicable to Eastern-Orthodox, 51.
Rome, Orthodox and, 28.

Russian Holy Synod, Epistle of, quoted, 33; report of, 66; and English bishops, 28.
Russian Theologians, different attitude to Greek, 66.

S.

Sacramental Privileges, interchanged, 44; accepted by Orthodox in Queensland, 47; extension not regulated, 49; instances of, Appendix III.
Sacraments, none valid outside the one Church, 52; Androutsos on matter, form, etc., 53 n.; Dyovouniotos on, 60; number of, 24, 65, 71; *see* Appendix I, § 2, *passim*.
Saints, invocation of, 24; Declaration upon, 93; why inserted, 94; *see* Appendix I, § 7.
Schismatics, Khomiakoff's statement, 51; Dyovouniotos on, 60.
Scholasticism, infiltration of, 67; Eastern-Orthodox suspicion of, 75.
Seven Sacraments, Androutsos' question, 14, 24, 71; Declaration upon, 92; *See* Appendix I, § 2, *passim*.
Sheridan, Mrs., quoted, 35 n.
Smyrna, Archbishop of, oration on Bishop Collins, 29 n.; declares Anglican Orders valid, 97.
Sokoloff, Professor, on Anglican Orders, 65.
Strictness not inconsistent with Economy, 57.
Swedish Church, economic intercommunion with, 100.
Symbolic Books, Five, necessary to study of Orthodoxy, 26; and Metousiosis, 73; definition, 117; list, 118.
Syropoulos, history, 26.
Syros, Abp. of, visits England, 43.

T.

Terms of Union, suggested, 31 n.; a mistake, 29, 32.
Theophilus of Athens quoted, 169.
Thirty-nine Articles, 13, 14, 70; and Eucharist, 72; on Sacrifice, 78; and Bible, 85; Declaration upon, 93.
Tikhon, the Patriarch, 66.
Tradition, inspired, 82; unchangeable, 85; Declaration upon, 91; how viewed, 115; *see* Appendix I, § 1, *passim*.
Transubstantiation, not demanded, 71; contrasted with Metousiosis, 74; Khomiakoff on, 77; *see* Appendix I, § 4, *passim*.
Trebizond, Metropolitan of, in England, 44.
Turks, oppression of Greeks, 67.

U.

Unbloody Sacrifice, Androutsos' question, 14, 71; his exposition, 78; Declaration upon, 92; *see* Appendix I, § 4, *passim*.
Unction, the Sacrament, *see* Appendix I, § 8.
Undivided Church, Faith of, the Eastern-Orthodox fundamental, 19, 23, 31; Declaration upon, 91.
Uniates, few, 23 n.; their colleges, 67 n.

W.

Weldon, Bishop, quoted, 37.
Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, his work, 17; policy, 28.

Y.

Young, Bishop, and Philaret, 76.

Printed by Hunt, Barnard & Co., Ltd., London and Aylesbury.

KU-998-815